THE HOUSE DIVIDED

ENGLAND, INDIA AND ISLAM

BY

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

IMAM OF THE MOSQUE, WOKING

Author of "India in the Balance," "Table Talk," "The Mother of Languages," etc., etc.

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE MOSQUE, WOKING

www.aaiil.org

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

First published in November 1922

(*All rights reserved*)

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, THE GRESHAM PRESS, LONDON AND WOKING

FOREWORD

In writing my book *India in the Balance*, I had in mind two great dominating convictions: first, that it is the British instinct to love justice; and secondly, that there is prevailing among the rank and file of the people of Great Britain an immense ignorance, and consequent indifference with regard to matters that should be of vital concern to them. Nevertheless, I was convinced also that the British mind is open to conviction, and that its sense of justice may be relied upon to find expression whenever the truth is placed fairly before it.

The reception of my book more than justified those impressions, and I have, in fact, received a great number of letters—some from quite unexpected quarters, candidly admitting the ignorance with regard to matters Indian under which the writers laboured, and expressing a sincere desire to do what is possible towards the amelioration of an admittedly disastrous state of things.

The real nature, and the reality, of the Caliphate grievance has become clear to many who had formerly been disposed to dismiss

it as part of the usual political claptrap. Many too have urged the bare justice of restoring Thrace, Smyrna and Anatolia to the Turk—and that, months before the Turkish arms had brought this step within the range not of merely practical, but even, from the Western point of view, desirable politics.

Many others have asked for suggestions, and have shown that they are indeed and at last, awake to the perils of the moment. In fact, the expectation—for it was something more than a hope—wherewith I set out to write my book has been, in a sense, more than realized.

But events move quickly, and the world has now come to yet another parting of the ways.

Everything now depends upon the approaching Peace Conference—of this I am convinced—and it is in the hope that that Conference will prove not merely a paraphrase of the Sèvres Treaty, as were the Conferences of London and Paris, but a genuine and determined effort to dig to the roots of the matter and to lay the foundations of a lasting era of goodwill, that I venture in these pages to state, as briefly and fairly as I can, the case for the Muslims, and India. .

Scarcely four months have passed since the appearance of *India in the Balance*, yet the

change that has taken place in the Indian mentality and the Indian point of view is one that would more readily suggest the lapse of four decades.

The Treaty of Sèvres—shattered like the porcelain which its name suggests—designed to decide the destinies of nations, failed utterly, because those who were responsible for its framing thought only, and not too prudently, of their own nations—leaving others out of account.

It opened with a bombastic flourish of Self-Determination, but alas, this blessed word, or rather the principle for which it was supposed to stand, that priceless legacy of the too benevolent Dr. Wilson—was, it would seem, only to be applied to the nations of the West.

There we have an initial error of omission, which it would be fatal to repeat. The object of the Treaty, flimsily veiled if it could be said to be veiled at all—was, in effect, to efface the Turk—to reduce him to a condition analogous to that of the Spanish Moors.

But the world had, after all, gone too far to countenance such a pandering to religious bigotry and fanaticism. Again and again the Cabinet was urged to set about the revision of the Treaty. The Government of India pressed for it; Mr. Montagu was compelled to resign—and all simply in an endeavour to induce

Mr. Lloyd George to respect his own words and to fulfil his own pledges.

To-day we see the frustration of all his aims, for a time at least, but not before his Government had been, in effect, compelled to grant to armed force that which they had refused to Justice and Honesty. The Turkish homelands have passed to the Turk after all, and with their passing, the prestige of the ex-Premier perished, and that of Great Britain in India received a deadly blow.

So, within this brief space of four months, India has become revolutionary to the core. India has felt herself rise from petitioner to dictator. Those whom the thunder of Downing Street inspired erstwhile with terror or respectful apprehension have learned to dissociate it altogether from any idea of lightning and to treat with the disregard of the scientist any menace from that quarter. Those who in times gone by were wont to approach the Viceroy with respect, beseeching him in faltering words to convey their humble petitions to the Premier, have had the courage to ignore the Viceroy's earnest efforts to dissuade them from passing a vote of censure on the Head of the Imperial Government. Those to whose lot it fell to receive official instructions and official consultations in the drafting of memorials to the Government, showed a united front with

the rest of the Legislative Assembly in opposing the Government—and the spectacle of such union had the effect of a bombshell.

But two months since, Muslims of all ranks, of all grades and classes had, in terms of the utmost respect, requested the Viceroy to ask the Premier to countenance a renewal of friendship with Turkey, and not to wage a new war; and to-day all Islam rushes eagerly to pick up the gauntlet, hurled down at Manchester, by the *soi-disant* champion of Christendom.

His avowed determination to wage war in defence of Christianity, though in all probability nothing more than the usual commonplace of party persiflage, designed in the first place to catch the religious, or shall we say, the denominational vote in the coming election struggle, was not so understood by Islam—by India. The East—unlearned in the niceties of up-to-date English political warfare—still takes a solemn declaration at its face value; and reads in the words of the ex-Premier a deliberate challenge.

Many other movements—with far-reaching possibilities—have lately made their appearance in India. The seeds of the upas tree sown in the soil of Sèvres are yielding an early harvest. The Akali movement, the Hijrat movement, the boycott of British goods, and many other

minor tendencies, variously labelled and disguised, are converging steadily in one direction, towards one goal, and still those whose interest is so seriously at stake are not as yet fully awakened to the situation.

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

THE MOSQUE, WOKING,
October 26, 1922.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD .	. . . . .	5
CHAPTER		
I.	ENGLAND IN THE BALANCE . .	13
II.	THE CHRISTIAN MINORITIES . .	21
III.	RESPONSIBILITY	38
IV.	THE AKALI MOVEMENT: AN OBJECT-LESSON	58
V.	NON-CO-OPERATION	79
VI.	THE ROOT OF THE MATTER . .	95
VII.	THE CALIPHATE IN ISLAM . . .	104
VIII.	RECONCILIATION OF ISLAM . .	121
IX.	THE IDEAL OF RELIGIONS . . .	136

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

CHAPTER I

ENGLAND IN THE BALANCE

It is not altogether difficult to understand India's misconception of what British public feeling really is. There is, in this realm of England a sort of evil genius which, in Near Eastern affairs, is ever at work and alert to confuse the real issues, and to befog by every possible means, plausible and otherwise, the good sense and judgment of the British people. Stories—some vague, some elaborately circumstantial—of inhuman tortures, incredible atrocities and revolting barbarity generally, in its most comprehensive form—and contradicted the next day—are given a special prominence in practically every journal—including those of repute.

On one day we read everywhere of the kidnapping by the victorious Turks of a hundred schoolgirls, from a Smyrna seminary for young ladies. We are told that these girls have

all been forced to enter harems, as the mildest of the fates in store for them; other possible treatment foreshadowed being vile enough to make the blood of any civilized being boil, be he Turk or Englishman.

On the very next day we read official tidings, which comparatively few newspapers take the trouble of publishing, of the safe arrival of these hundred schoolgirls at Athens.

Then again, from Malta comes the report of an actual eye-witness of Kemalist excesses in Smyrna, containing the customary lurid indictment of the implacable Turk.

If, however, the reader thinks for a moment (and perhaps, on an average, one in seventy-seven of newspaper readers may be relied on to do so), he will discover that the alleged eye-witness could not have performed the journey from Smyrna to Malta, by any mundane boat at least, in time to relate the events detailed on the date given.

Nay, even on October 14th last, when all the facts that are ever likely to appear on the subject had come to light, Mr. Lloyd George, in his Manchester speech, did not scruple not only once more to charge the Turks with the wanton destruction of their own richest city, Smyrna, but also to treat as acknowledged facts those elaborate allegations of massacre, plunder and outrage which

have over and over again in the last few weeks, been proved to be absolutely devoid of foundation.

The truth is that the fabrications, so promptly noised abroad, continue to hold the imagination; while the contradictions, even when they are read, are apt to take a secondary place. Such is the mentality of mankind.

That the massacre in appalling circumstances of 10,000 unoffending Greeks, which moved the House of Commons, through Mr. T. P. O'Connor, so greatly in the early part of this year has actually after all proved to be a Greek invention, designed by way of counterbalance to certain outrages of their own in Thrace and Anatolia, which have since been, alas! too well authenticated, is now an established fact, and should have been a lesson against promiscuous belief in unfounded rumour.

It is not my intention to seek to exonerate my co-religionists from any wrongs of which they may have been guilty; I do but deprecate the use of disingenuous—I had almost said deliberately false—propaganda, for the purpose of concealing the true facts from the knowledge of the nation.

I do not speak lightly. The situation has, by this time, become so grave as to necessitate the services, in the coming Cabinet, of a states-

man of quite exceptional wisdom and foresight, if it is to be handled in any way effectively.

As I have already pointed out in *India in the Balance*, all these Near Eastern matters have come to be regarded as a sort of tug-of-war between Christianity and Islam.

On the one side we have the Government of Great Britain, claiming to be the greatest Muslim Power in the world, ruling an Empire wherein the Muslims vastly outnumber the Christians; on the other must be placed the attitude of certain of its late Ministers, which may well have led the unsuspecting or the ignorant to the belief that to bear witness for Christianity and to protect Christians everywhere is England's chosen mission; so much so, indeed, that the Government at Athens must needs appeal by cable to England to save the Christians, i.e. the Greeks, from the fate which, it is asserted, awaits them. Here again the unfortunate Manchester speech of the late Premier did not tend to allay the mischief.

Be that as it may, however, the exigencies of the present crisis require that such sentimentalities should no longer be permitted to overshadow the nation's judgment.

Consider, if only for a moment, how necessary it is that good relations of friendship and

loving-kindness should exist between England and the world of Islam.

When you have some eighty millions of Muslims in India, with a Hindu population nearly three times as great, to support their claims and aspirations, believing them to be just, and when you have the population of the Malayan peninsula and archipelago under more than semi-British rule and numbering some thirty millions of Muslims—East, West and South Africa, each with a large Muslim population—Mesopotamia, Palestine and Hedjaz purely Muslim countries—and add to these the Muslims in the various British colonies, it is surely high time to hit upon some policy which shall be just and acceptable.

'With pain and consternation I have been watching a development of events which is full of nothing but menace to the British cause.

While the whole Muslim world was frenziedly protesting against the pillage, the plunder and the bloodshed wrought by the Greeks in Thrace and Anatolia, people here in England were concerned not at all with the fate of the unfortunate Muslim population, but were in their turn being worked up to a species of vicarious frenzy, by reported massacres of Greeks by Turks—one moiety, let us say, of the subjects of the Empire upbraiding the Christians, the other reviling Muslims.

If then this tension between the two classes or sections of British subjects is to increase day by day, and with it, enmity between Islam and Christianity, the result must needs be inevitable and obvious.

But it should have been otherwise.

Islam harbours no animosity against the Christian, and the followers of the Blessed One who preached "Love thine enemy" (an injunction which, by the way, has never yet been put in practice) ought not to have hatred towards Muslims—if indeed they are concerned to follow their Master. Christianity and Islam are, in truth, sister religions, and if their adherents would but cleave to the words of their respective founders, the problem that has proved the most baffling in the administration of the Empire, would be solved easily enough.

Attempt any other solution—on diplomatic lines, for example—and you are bound to fail; for diplomacy has become synonymous with duplicity, and not without justice.

When every effort is made in England in certain circles (which, in no sense representative of the country, are yet commonly regarded as such abroad) to minimize the effect of the recent Turkish victories, and the efforts of the Turk to maintain his age-long honourable tradition of clean-fighting, in India, in her

thousands of mosques throughout the land, men were reciting prayers, convening mass meetings of humble thanksgiving to God for the glorious victory that He has been pleased to vouchsafe to them--the Muslims of India—through their brethren in Faith, the Turks.

A house divided against itself cannot stand; and shall an Empire live in peace, when religious and racial prejudices in it, two most vital elements, are working with such hostility against each other, more especially when the non-English element has reason to believe that a section of the Cabinet as well has taken, or is likely to take, sides against it? The astute Greek knew well enough the weak point in the Governmental armour; and "Protect Christians," "Save Christianity," were the burden of his message, upon which he relied with tolerable confidence for winning the ear of the British people.

Sometimes one is tempted to wonder if Greeks are in truth Christians, and whether the units of these "Christian minorities" of which we hear so much, do indeed deserve to arrogate to themselves the name of the Prince of Peace.

However that may be, they know how to play their cards; and if it be asked why they do not make their appeal in the name of humanity, the answer may well be that it

is because experience has taught them that it pays better to work upon the religious susceptibilities of Great Britain.

And the gravity of the situation thus created is extreme.

The Muslim world believes, reluctantly and at last, that the issue is, after all, between Islam and Christianity, with England as the latter's champion; and it is for English statesmanship to show, by policy and action, that this is not so.

England is in the balance.

She is being weighed. Let her look to it that she be not found wanting.

Mr. Shortt, the ex-Home Secretary, on September 16th, speaking presumably on behalf of the Government, urged that Great Britain has consistently acted in the interests of her Muslim subjects, and that the present crisis is due solely to a misinterpretation of the Government's motives and actions; which misinterpretation is, in its turn due to the circulation of mischievous enemy propaganda.

Is such really the case?

My object in this book is to examine the impressions at present prevailing in the minds of the Muslim peoples, and the causes—the actual facts rather than the suspicions or conjectures, which have given rise to these impressions, and to ask, Is it indeed an enemy that hath done this thing?

CHAPTER II

THE CHRISTIAN MINORITIES

THE question of "Christian Minorities," and their right to protection, has for many years past been on the lips of European statesmen, and going the round of the Press. It is a noble sentiment, and one which a Muslim—provided he is true to his own convictions—can in no way oppose. If its object is to champion the cause of Christian minorities oppressed by a non-Christian Power—be it Turkish or any other—for the simple reason that they belong to the Christian religion, it is incumbent first and foremost on a Muslim to defend them, if necessary, by force of arms. His very religion lays upon him this duty, for the Qur-án, alone of all Scriptures, has enjoined the unsheathing of the sword to establish and support freedom of conscience. If, however, the motive is to serve temporal ends under the cover of religion, it is an entirely different matter.

Ought the "Christian minorities" under Turkish rule to enter into conspiracies with

Christian Powers against their own Government? Is such action anything short of treason? Can the defence of such "Christian minorities" be considered as in any sense a defence of Christianity, and not mere encouragement of sedition?

The Armenians and Greeks were Turkish subjects, and yet in the recent Great War they actually aided and abetted those with whom Turkey was at war. You sent Roger Casement to the gallows without a murmur; but when the Turk deals similarly with a similar offence, you call him assassin and cut-throat. That is the point of view from which India and the East regard the "Christian minorities" propaganda, and, unfortunately, facts and figures seem to afford it some justification.

The Muslim world regards these myths of "Christian minorities" as camouflage pure and simple. They are intended to serve as a pretext—not less flimsy than that of the tiger in the fable, seeking occasion to devour the lamb—for foreign prying into the internal affairs of Turkey, to bring external pressure to bear on it, and, if need be, to justify the waging of a war against it. Had these stories been, as trumpeted aloud to the world, the outcome of humanitarian motives, the Government of Mr. Lloyd George would scarcely

have watched with complacency the Greek excesses in Thrace and Anatolia. Are not the Turks members of the same human race in the name of which is raised the cry in defence of the Greek and the Armenian? True Christianity, like Islam, is, I think, or like to think, but another name for humanitarianism; and a Muslim can have no quarrel at all with a Christian, as such, over anything arising from considerations of humanity. But the difficulty is that the Muslim fails to detect the *bona fides* of all such humanitarian claims, and not without reason. When it is a question of the Turk being subjected to sword and fire, it strikes no chord of sympathy or fellow-feeling in the heart of those statesmen that pose as champions of humanity on behalf of "Christian minorities." Obviously, therefore, something other than the good of humanity would seem to be at stake. A Christian Government would be anything but Christian were it to view with indifference the systematic extermination of a whole people; but this, unfortunately, is just what Mr. Lloyd George and his friends did. Their disclaiming all knowledge of what has been going on in Thrace and Anatolia, ever since the day of the Greek occupation of these territories, is hardly a compliment to themselves.

These are the facts, sad, yet solid. The

conviction prevails in the East generally, and the world of Islam, in particular, that the question of "Christian minorities" is just a pretext for weakening Turkish rule, and establishing 'Special Régimes" and "Mandates"; and a glance at the other terms of the Treaty of Sèvres deepens that conviction.

Non-Muslims, it is alleged, enjoy no liberty of conscience under Turkish rule. If so, the Turk forfeits, under the verdict of the Qur-án, all title to rule. It is anti-Islamic in any way to interfere with the religious freedom of subject peoples. The Muslim world can have no sympathy with the Turks in any such encroachments, if only the charge against them could be established. As it is, however, they have reason to dismiss it as a fabrication.

Facts and figures force them to that conclusion. The tragedies of Spain and Sicily are old, old stories. The fate of the millions that made up the Muslim populations there, needs no recalling. But, after centuries of Muslim rule, the Christian minorities are still Christian. Salonika is a recent case. What about the Muslim element which was in the majority there? On the other hand, the very existence of the Balkan States and of Armenia gives the lie direct to any such accusation brought against the Turk. These communities furnish a living testimony to the

fact that, under Muslim rule, the existence of non-Muslims is safe and secure.

Take another case—that of India. After about a thousand years of strong Muslim rule, what do we find? Of a total population of 400,000,000, more than two-thirds is non-Muslim to this day. And even the 80,000,000 of the Muslim element consists mainly of the descendants of the Muslim immigrants—the Arabs, the Pathans, the Moghuls, the Syeds and Bloachs. Conversion—and that by all legitimate methods—has added a comparatively insignificant number. These are hard facts of history, and surely no other testimony is needed to establish the conclusion that whithersoever the Crescent has penetrated, its policy has been to live and let live. Non-Muslims have been afforded every facility that may conduce to prosperity. The bending and twisting of the Qur-ánic verses to suit his own ends, the elaboration of verbal quibbles as to the teachings of Islam—all this is nothing but the well-planned propaganda of the adversary, which Muslims have, by now, learned to see through.

The ex-Premier, while yet in office, said in his Manchester speech that God had given him a sword, and as long as He gave him strength, he would wield it in defence of the Christians. The people are sick of war, and

the ex-Premier's remark has aroused controversy only in the daily papers; some of which insist on representing him in their illustrations as wielding a golf-club instead of a sword. Yet I venture to maintain that, at times, it becomes one of our highest humanitarian duties to unsheathe the sword. We cannot conscientiously stand aside as indifferent spectators when the liberties of an oppressed people are being trampled upon, or when religious freedom is at stake. Even so gentle a teacher as Jesus Christ, had to avow that he had come to send fire and sword into the world.

There do arise situations when the use of arms becomes an unavoidable necessity. Could Jesus view the agonies of a downtrodden people without striking a blow in their defence? And such a blow might he not, in all probability, have struck had his ministry not been cut short? Likewise, Muhammad not only permitted the use of arms under such circumstances, but made it a high virtue, saying that Paradise lies under the shadow of the sword.

Islam has long been stigmatized as a religion of the sword; but that is a story of bygone days. Church dignitaries themselves spared no pains during the Great War to justify warfare from the teachings of Jesus;

though, by the way, a contributor to the *Islamic Review*[1] has shown that in their sermons on war the Bishops of London and Chelmsford were walking in the footsteps of Muhammad rather than of the Christ.

So we Muslims are at one with Mr. Lloyd George in his plea for the use of the sword in defence of helpless Christians. To us it is a religious obligation to protect those persecuted for their religious convictions—be they Muslims or non-Muslims. We therefore have nothing but respect for this sentiment of the ex-Premier. Indeed, we should have been quite ready to co-operate with him in its realization. But the ways and means that his Government adopted were far from desirable. It may be that he could find no guidance in the matter in the teachings of Jesus.

The apparent contradictions in the recorded teaching of Jesus as to the use of the sword, perplexing as they may be to the student of the Gospels, are consistent in Muslim eyes —nay, they are to him the teachings of very truth itself.

Occasions, as they arise, must be dealt with by appropriate methods; and what may be objectionable in one case becomes indispensable in another. Hence, the apparently conflicting nature of the Master's words, which

[1] Vol. v, No. 9.

are, in fact, intended to meet different situations—situations the nature of which he would no doubt have explained had it not been for the very brief duration of his ministry. He had not time enough at his disposal, and so he promised the coming of *another* Teacher (St. John xvi.); and we Muslims find that other Teacher in the Prophet Muhammad. It was Muhammad who enlightened mankind on this all-important phase of human life. He showed—in precept as well as in practice—under what circumstance a Son of God shall send fire and sword into the world and under what his love goes out even to his enemies. Read the sacred words of the Master in the light of the Qur-án, and they embody the very truth; otherwise they seem impracticable and inconsistent. Christian preachers are often themselves at a loss to make out the precise purport of these teachings. They elect to regard them as abstract idealism. But they are not so to a Muslim. To him they are quite intelligible—in fact, the only true and practical teaching.

It will not be out of place here to make a passing reference to the Muslim ethics of war. Mr. Bonar Law, the new Prime Minister, has held out a policy of peace to the world, and for that, all must be profoundly thankful. But none can foretell when the havoc of a new

war may burst upon humanity. Perhaps some prospective Lloyd George—if not that gentleman in person—may find the shadow of a suggestion in these lines. If a Christian Government unsheathe the sword in defence of Christians, then a Muslim, on the principles which we indicate below on the authority of the Qur-án, will stand shoulder to shoulder with it, even though, in so doing, he be acting in opposition to a Muslim Power.

The Qur-án sanctions the use of the sword under certain circumstances. First and foremost, in the cause of religion—religion as such, it must be borne in mind, and not Islam exclusively. For this, two distinct occasions have been mentioned. First, when a house of worship is in danger—be it Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, or any other—a Muslim is enjoined to shed his very blood to save it from demolition. Says the Qur-án .—

> Permission (to fight) is given to those upon whom war is made because they are oppressed, and most surely Allah is well able to assist them;
>
> Those who have been expelled from their homes without a just cause except that they say: Our Lord is Allah. And had there not been Allah's repelling some people by others, certainly there would have been pulled down cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques in which Allah's name is much remembered; and surely Allah will help him who helps *His cause*; most surely Allah is Strong, Mighty (chap. xxii, vers. 39, 40).

It is significant that the mosque is mentioned last of all. This single verse has since been responsible for the safety of all buildings dedicated to any form of worship. Notwithstanding a thousand years of Muslim rule, India is still the home of thousands of the temples of idolatry. Can history produce a parallel to such magnanimity? Where are the great and gorgeous mosques, one may ask, that were once the glory of Spain, Sicily, Southern France, Malta, and elsewhere? To pick out a solitary instance here and there of the conversion of a non-Muslim house of worship into a mosque, is to make a mountain out of a molehill. Such cases—which are too rare to deserve any serious mention at all—are exceptions, due to indiscreetness on the part of individuals, and do, actually, only tend to establish the rule.

Again, the use of the sword is also permissible when freedom of conscience is at stake. Of all religions, Islam stands conspicuous in establishing a perfection of religious freedom. "There is no compulsion in matters religious,"[1] proclaimed the Qur-án, which has since been the Magna Charta of religion for peoples of all creeds under the rule of Islam. Not only is all interference with another's religious views forbidden, but, should such interference be

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. ii, ver. 256.

enforced at the point of the sword, it is the duty of a Muslim to repel it with the sword. In the matter of religion, none may stand between man and God. It is the birthright of man to hold whatever convictions he deems right. Persecution of others must be resisted at all costs by a Muslim, irrespective of whether the aggrieved be a Jew, or a Christian, or of any other faith. For this purpose the Muslim is not only allowed, but enjoined, to fight until perfect religious liberty has been established.[1]

As regards temporal affairs, authority to wield the sword has been limited to one, and only one, case—self-defence. This permission has been further restricted by the condition that as soon as the enemy shall have suspended hostilities, and shown an inclination towards peace, then Muslims must do the same. This is a principle which Britain acted upon during the Great War; and the Church supported her. Whatever the interpretation put upon the Sermon on the Mount, the fact remains that in comporting herself as she did in the Great War, Britain followed the teaching and example of the Prophet of Arabia.

Muhammad had to fight seven battles in all, of which the first three—the principal ones, the rest being more of the nature of

[1] See Muhammad Ali's translation of the Holy Qur-án, chap. ii, vers. 192, 193.

skirmishes when a general state of war prevails—best illustrate the principle in question. For thirteen long years the Prophet and his comrades were the victims of inhuman persecutions at the hands of the Meccans—an historical fact admitted by friend and foe. He suffered all this without retaliation. When, however, things reached a pitch when his life itself was in imminent danger, some safeguard became necessary. The very night when the conspirators were to make away with him, he managed to escape with his life to Medina, in the company of his devoted friend Abu Bakr. But his enemies did not let him alone, even in this far-off refuge—150 miles from Mecca. Jealous of his success in his new place of sojourn, they made repeated efforts to nip the tender plant of Islam in the bud. In all these three battles, the locality of the battlefield is, I think, a decisive factor, showing that the Muslims were constrained to resort to the sword in sheer self-defence. The first of these was fought at Badr, 120 miles distant from Mecca, the enemy headquarters, and 30 miles from Medina. And what was the comparative strength of the contending parties? 313 Muslims against 1,000 Meccans.

Uhad was the scene of the second battle. It was still nearer the Muslim's home of adoption —only 12 miles from Medina. The relative

strength this time was about 1,000 Muslims to 3,000 Meccans.

The third was an attack on the town itself. Siege was laid to Medina with an army 10,000 strong. Do not these facts and figures—the locality of the action and the relative strength of the two—furnish conclusive testimony to the fact that self-defence was the only motive which prompted the Muslims to strike a blow? This is exactly the occasion when Jesus would have us sell our clothes to purchase swords. But it was left to Muhammad to illustrate also the practical application of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, and this he did in a manner unique in the history of the world. With 10,000 men he marched against Mecca—the same Mecca which was the scene, for long years, of Muslim persecution. The town surrendered, and was occupied without the spilling of a drop of blood. The vanquished, who had spared no ingenuity in inflicting tortures on Muslims—the ringleaders of the deadly opposition, tormentors, oppressors, and assassins—lay wholly at the mercy of the victors. No punishment would have been too hard for them, according to modern military laws. But was it that the "Spirit of Truth" had to perfect the teachings of the Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount—to lead people into

" all truth " ? Was it for him to illustrate, in practice, the precept of Jesus, " Love thine enemy " ?

Summoning their leading men, he announced his decision—a decision beyond their wildest expectations of leniency—" This day there shall be no reproach on you." Such a magnanimous amnesty secured to the Muslims what could never have been gained in any other way—victory over their enemies' hearts, by love. The gulf of decades of bloodthirsty malice was bridged by a single stroke. Love was applied to anoint and heal the raw wound of hate. The great and famous dynasty of Muslim rulers—the Umayyads—to whom the world is indebted for vast treasures of art, of science and of philosophy, sprang from the descendants of the ringleader of enemies thus won over.

So long as man is what he is, and his nature is not a true Muslim or a true Christian nature —which are at bottom one and the same— war will remain an indispensable factor of human life. Nevertheless, until the arrival of the millennium, much can be done to alleviate the terror and the suffering which are the outcome of wanton brutality. Consequently, Islam, recognizing war as an unavoidable evil, has at the same time laid down as far as possible, rules and regulations to reduce its

evils to the minimum. The Hague Conferences, too, some years since, framed a code of warfare for obviating unnecessary bloodshed, loss and suffering; but how far it has succeeded in practice it is not for me to say. If, however, such restrictions had been imposed by the Hand of God, the adherents of the various religions of the world would have been more careful to abide by them. The Qur-án lays down:—

Permission (to fight) is given to those upon whom war is made because they are oppressed, and most surely Allah is well able to assist them (chap. xxii, ver. 39).

And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you, and do not exceed the limits; surely Allah does not love those who exceed the limits.

And kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from whence they drove you out, and persecution is severer than slaughter; and do not fight with them at the sacred mosque until they fight with you in it, but if they do fight you, then slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers.

But if they desist, then surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

And fight with them until there is no persecution, and religion should be only for Allah; but if they desist, then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors (chap. ii, vers. 190–193).

The Prophet Muhammad also enunciated a system of war, which I give below, in the words of his immediate successor, Abu Bakr:—

When you meet your enemies in the fight, comport yourself as befits good Muslims, and remember to prove

yourselves the true descendants of Ishmail. In the order and disposition of the host, and in all battles, be careful to follow your banners boldly, and be ever obedient to your leaders. Never yield to, or turn your backs on, your enemies; it is for the cause of good that you fight. You are incited by no less noble a desire than His glory; therefore, fear not to enter into the fight nor let the numbers of your foes alarm you even though excessive. If God should give you the victory, *do not abuse your advantages, and beware how you stain your swords in the blood of him who yields; neither touch ye the children, the women, nor the infirm old men whom ye may find among your enemies. In your progress through the enemy's land cut down no palms, or other fruit trees; destroy not the products of the earth; ravage no fields; burn no dwellings; from the stores of your enemies take only what you need for your wants.* Let no destruction be made without necessity, but occupy the city of the enemy; and if there be any that may serve as an asylum to your adversaries, them do you destroy. Treat the prisoners and him who renders himself to your mercy with pity, as God shall do to you in your need; but trample down the proud and rebellious, nor fail to crush all who have broken the conditions imposed on them. Let there be no perfidy nor falsehood in your treaties with your enemies: be faithful in all things, proving yourself ever upright and noble, and maintaining your word and promise truly. *Do not disturb the quiet of the monk or hermit and destroy not their abodes, but inflict the rigour of death upon all who shall refuse the conditions you may impose upon them.* (*The Law Quarterly Review*, 1908.)

I leave it to the judgment of the reader to decide how far these regulations, if universally adopted, would have contributed to the welfare of humanity. Generally speaking, they have been observed by Muslims ever since. The

most recent example has been seen in the peaceful occupation, by Mustapha Kemal's victorious army, of a territory where their brethren in blood and in faith had been subjected to the utmost devastation of fire and sword.

CHAPTER III

RESPONSIBILITY

WE have heard of the happenings at Smyrna —and who is there among us who has not shuddered at the ghastly tale?

Yet Smyrna was but the final, culminating scene of a hideous drama of fanaticism, crime, and outrage, upon which the curtain rose with the signing of this same Treaty of Sèvres.

The burning of towns and villages, whereby tens of thousands of innocent and helpless folk were rendered homeless and destitute; pillage, murder, rape, and every crime, conceivable or inconceivable, had swept like a devastating whirlwind through Thrace and Anatolia —nay, even to the very vilayet of Constantinople itself. All the denunciations, all the resentment wrung from Europe by the fate of Smyrna, have come many months too late. The conscience of Western civilization had, it would seem, fallen asleep, to awake, with the startled panic of the suddenly awakened, only in the closing days of September; and the question now for conscience the world over

—be it Eastern or Western—is simply this: "Who is responsible for this outrage on humanity?"

Guns and diplomacy may arrive at any decision that may seem good to them, but unless and until the real cause of the trouble is sifted and removed, it will be well-nigh impossible for friendly relations to exist between the Muslim world and Christendom.

One fact which Muslims have throughout consistently believed is now generally conceded on all hands, and that is, that those responsible for the Treaty of Sèvres, and the subsequent misguided policy and pro-Greek proclivities of the late Government, have become the responsible Patrons, as it were, of that International Exhibition of Brutal and Insensate Depravity, for which the fate of Smyrna has furnished forth, with a tragic realism, the culminating spectacle. I earnestly beg of all who read my book, that they do not permit themselves, in the heat of the moment, to be led away. Issues of vital importance are at stake. Not the Muslim world only, but the whole of the East, and especially India, are day by day losing faith in the British nation.

If the reins of government be not in the hands of men who are above the influence of personal predilections and personal motives, British prestige will go.

It is not insignificant that the Indian Legislative Assembly should have unanimously passed a vote of censure on the late Prime Minister; and that neither the presence nor the personality of the Viceroy could dissuade them from doing so; while, apart altogether from the caustic speculation—alas too common in the Indian Press—as to the genuineness and honesty of purpose of Mr. Lloyd George, the general feeling of distrust throughout the country is, by now, genuine enough.

It is all very well for the British Press to speak its mind with candour on the subject of the *bona fides*, or otherwise, of responsible Ministers. It may perhaps be regarded as a species of safety-valve when, for example, Mr. Asquith and his party, on relinquishing office, are alluded to as "the old gang"—but Indian mentality is altogether different. In the Indian conception of statesmanship, honesty—not expediency—is the watchword.

I quote the following Hindu opinion as to your statesmen and politicians, which appears in a religious paper—*World Peace*:—

The common saying is when God destroys one He withdraws one's good sense and vision. That has been the case with statesmen and politicians. Their vision has been cut off, and the power of true perception has been withdrawn from them. They are blundering and bungling and muddling everywhere, and making confusion more confounded.

They failed to evolve real peace at Versailles. That was their greatest blunder. Since then, for the sin of neglecting to see truth in the face, even when it was pointed out to them, they have been led from one blunder to another. Mishap and failure have followed them everywhere. To whatever they have set their hands —and they are being forced by circumstances to set their hands to everything—it has withered and crumbled and been more confused under their touch.

They failed with Germany—they failed with Austria —they failed with Turkey—they failed with Russia, with Silesia, with Mesopotamia, with Syria—they have failed everywhere and heightened human misery and suffering. As they have sown, so are they reaping.

The action of the Indian Legislative Assembly was declared by the *Pall Mall Gazette* to be "unparalleled," and so it was. But could the writer find any parallel in the whole history of British statesmanship to this spectacle of a British Premier giving the lie to an Act of Parliament, and to the word of his King?

By such policy—or lack of policy—things have come to this pass; and if the honour and good name of the British nation, in the world's eyes, are to be saved, then it is essential that cool and unbiassed consideration be given to the originating causes of the catastrophe, and that strict justice be done.

The Kemalists stand exonerated in the eyes of the Muslim world; for their war against

the Greeks was counted a righteous war, sanctioned by the Qur-án—and the whole of the East is behind them: and Muslims do not consider such an attitude in any sense open to criticism.

The Turk is, in their eyes, the stag at bay.

If the combined diplomacy of Europe has indeed, as is now pretty generally admitted, aimed at the drawing up of the death-warrant of Turkey as a Western Power—the object of the recent British action having been avowedly that of expelling the Turk from Europe—it was at Sèvres that the first attempt was made to execute that warrant.

The Treaty contained nothing less than a sentence of death, and the duty of carrying out that sentence was entrusted to a nation whose reputation for cringing ferocity and brutal cowardice, has been more than sufficient to place it outside the pale of civilization.

It is commonly alleged that considerations of creed, colour, or race were not in any way the guiding principles in the drafting of the Treaty, but that, on the contrary, impartial treatment was meted out to all the parties concerned; and that Turkey, beaten in the war, must, like her allies, submit to such punishment as to the conquerors might seem good.

It is well enough for the uninformed public

of Great Britain to reason thus, but not for those who are acquainted with the terms of the Treaty—still less for the persons who had a share in the framing of it.

It is true that Germany was compelled to forfeit Alsace-Lorraine; but in doing so she was only restoring to France what, prior to 1870, had been French.

Austria, again, was split up into divers small States, on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination; but it may be argued that peoples, formerly under the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, ought rather to thank their stars that they are free from Prussianism at last, and on the truly royal road to Democracy—which, in the eyes of many, should be the ultimate goal of national endeavour.

Bulgaria, on the other hand, was, as to territory and internal economy, left practically undisturbed.

The Muslim Power in the West became the scapegoat whose doom it was to bear the burden of the curse of defeat; the booty for which the conqueror looked was to be supplied from her possessions. Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria, Hedjaz, Armenia, and Kurdistan, all were wrested from her. Before the war her empire comprised 612,724 square miles; it was proposed that of these she should be

mulcted of 441,447, under the Treaty—nearly three-fourths of her entire territory. It may be argued that the dismemberment of Turkey was effected on this same sacred principle of self-determination; inasmuch as the several provinces concerned were largely populated by non-Turkish races, which should be given each its chance of development under that principle, the establishment of which, with its manifold if indeterminate blessings, had, it was somewhat suddenly discovered, been one of the principal causes for which the war had been waged. This being so, Turkey could only be awarded her own homelands—that is to say, those countries predominantly Turkish in population.

A plausible pretext, this, for justifying the mutilation of the Turkish Empire; but coming events were to show that the simplicity of the task had been greatly over-estimated.

The case of Palestine, for example, is sufficiently instructive. Palestine is chiefly populated by Arabs (Muslim and Christian), who have, moreover, served with the Allies during the war. They are, therefore, doubly entitled to put in a claim for self-determination, and to object to the infliction upon them of an alien race.

Their delegation, despatched to this country for the purpose of making their views under-

stood, was permitted to linger on fruitlessly, month after month—yet not altogether fruitlessly, for they learnt one lesson not readily to be forgotten, to wit, that the phrases of European diplomacy are so designed as to be capable of varying their significance to suit all possible exigencies of creed and colour, by means of a most pliable and convenient device—which device is known as the "mandate."

This handy little word is susceptible of any meaning you please, on the lips of those to whom that which it is supposed to signify, has been given; especially when a brand-new institution, such as the League of Nations, has been hastily—but effectively enough—contrived for the purpose of giving quasi-legal confirmation to any interpretation a mandatory Power may think fit to select.

Has the League of Nations given any consideration to the just demands of the Palestinian delegates? Or has it only confined itself to re-echoing the decision of the British Cabinet of that time; which decision was, in its turn, only a paraphrase of the Balfour Declaration?

If the modern Huns—with all the instincts of barbarism which they were not ashamed to indulge during the war—could be trusted to rule themselves, without a mandatory Power

over them, where lies the necessity for bringing free, already self-determined, Muslim nationalities under the yoke of a foreign dominion, however tactfully disguised as a "mandate"?

The Austrians were enemies, the Arabs of Palestine friends and allies; yet Palestine aspires, it would seem, in vain for treatment analogous to that accorded, say, to Czecho-Slovakia.

Turkey's punishment, however, did not end there. Her people were deemed unfit for self-determination—a "by-product of Nature," as the then prophet of the British nation, Horatio Bottomley, termed them in 1918—deserving to be swept from the face of God's earth—and that, although the late Prime Minister had, that same year, for reasons best known to himself, made use of the now historic words: "Nor are we fighting . . . to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race . . . we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race, with its capital at Constantinople" (January 5, 1918).

This declaration was further stated by Mr. Lloyd George to be "unqualified" and "very deliberate." "It was," he said, "made with the consent of all parties in the community.

It was not opposed by the Labour Party." (February 1920.)

Under the principle, therefore, of self-determination—the guiding principle of the Treaty—Thrace, Asia Minor, and Anatolia should have gone to Turkey; *a fortiori*, they should have been so restored, by virtue of the above-quoted pledge given in this unqualified and very deliberate fashion by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. But the world—the Eastern portion of it at least, had yet to learn that a man's greatness in diplomacy is to be measured, it would seem, according to Mr. Lloyd George's conception of the matter, by his capacity for breaking pledge after pledge, without consciousness of moral perturbation.

It is with a sense of acute discomfiture, and with bitter heart-searchings, that we Indians learnt the lesson which the Treaty of Sèvres was to teach us, when the homelands of the Turkish race were given to Greece.

The allotment of these territories to Greece not only lacked justification in itself, but was, moreover, an inexplicable riddle. It was left for subsequent events to explain the novel —not to say highly specialized—treatment which was reserved for Turkey. This proved after all to be nothing less than a reversion to the old and well-tried principle of "assimilation"

—that is to say, extermination and expulsion to make room for others; the Turkish homelands were, in short, to become Hellenized. The ink of the Treaty was scarcely dry, when the Hellenic methods of "assimilation"—murder, pillage, burning of cities and standing crops, outraging of women and young girls, and kindred abominations—began. Hourieh Hanoum, a lady aged sixty, of Orham Ghazi, was dishonoured by Greek ruffians. A six-months-old baby, in the village of Kapali was not spared. Mosques, shrines and temples were burned and destroyed, and some of them converted into stables for horses. Crops ready for the sickle were burnt, and those who could not contrive to escape the Greek devilry were left to starve. No fewer than seventy villages were reduced to ashes; and many of them disappeared from the map for good. I have in my possession a detailed account of the butchery perpetrated by the degenerate descendants of those who, once upon a time, were famed for the refinement of their taste and for their advanced civilization. The narrative is borne out by photographs, but I cannot reproduce them here, although they have found their way into the Indian Press. It is not my desire to add fuel to the fire of consternation, anger, and disgust which is already raging furiously in Muslim breasts;

especially when many of them regard certain of the Allies as accomplices in this most hideous thing. I would, however, refer my readers to the reports of the Misses Annie J. Allen and Florence I. Billings, members of the American Relief Committee in Anatolia (*Muslim Standard*, Sept. 1922), and I do so for the sole reason that the account in question has already been disseminated broadcast throughout India; while here, in England, it seems to have escaped the public notice altogether.

Their words are significant—but not more so, I fear, than the deliberate silence observed by those in a position to know, and who actually do know, the vile things done by a *soi-disant* Christian soldiery in the Turkish homelands, and the readiness everywhere to acquiesce in reports of "Turkish Atrocities." It is this sinister phenomenon which has forced the East to believe that even the words of these two charitable ladies are doomed to fall on ears that have no desire to hear.

I confess that I have felt sorely tempted to reproduce here in full the report of Mr. Maurice Gehri—delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross—who accompanied the Inter Allied Inquiry Mission in Anatolia, but I have thought it well, on the whole, to

spare the reader this revolting narrative of what may surely, without injustice, be called the Greek Anti-Christ. Those who elected to blame me for weakness—not to say inaccuracy—when, in writing *India in the Balance*, I had occasion to touch on this unsavoury subject of the Greek abomination, will find the detailed particulars set forth in the *Muslim Standard* of September 7, 1922, which gives Mr. Gehri's report in full, as well as details of many other Greek inhumanities.

That report not only proves that the regions in which the Greek excesses were committed were Turkish in population—and should, therefore, never have been handed over—but that the perpetrators were bold enough, strong, it may be, in the consciousness of the "moral" support of some Western Power, to persist in their hideous work, in the very presence of the Mission.

The reports of these ghastly deeds remained suppressed, and one could almost justify the suppression if something had been done to stop them; but nothing was done, and the Greeks, taking non-interference for encouragement, continued their work of "assimilation" unchecked. But the moment the two American ladies dared to lift the veil from the Greek abomination, the world was, on a sudden, taken aback, startled, terrified by

the pitiful story of the murder of 10,000 Greeks.

This, as has since been established, was yet another ingenious fiction of the Greek, designed to divert the attention of the world from his own black deeds.

Perhaps the most regrettable part of the whole affair, from a British point of view, was the part played by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., in publicly charging the Turks with this massacre of 10,000 Greeks. Whatever may have been the purport, in Mr. O'Connor's eyes, of the report of Major Yowell, who seems to have been able to contrive to curb his conscience easily enough so long as he was on service; and was only compelled by its belated prickings to give his story, with all its American embroidery, to the world after he had been dismissed and expelled by the Turkish authorities; the accusation itself, with which, by the way, his own superior, Captain Jackwith, emphatically dissociated himself, does not go beyond the assertion that the 10,000 unfortunate souls in question "died, or were left to die." This cannot be called murder in any sense of the word. Then again, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, did not improve matters when, in reply to the question of Mr. O'Connor, instead of reading out the two telegrams

which he had received from the High Commissioners at Constantinople, and which would have put the affair in quite a different light, he unfortunately, by his equivocal statement, lent an indirect, but none the less official, support to an absolutely unverified and, as it turned out, an unfounded rumour. It may have been a mistake, but such a mistake is open to any and every misconstruction.

Such was the fate of the Turkish homelands, handed over to Greece, in direct contravention of the clear and definite pledges of the then Prime Minister.

But even thus the Greeks were not content. The Treaty of Sèvres had not been ratified; and the Greeks, already established in Smyrna, launched an attack on that part of Anatolia which, under the Treaty, was permitted to remain Turkish, and that at the very moment when the representatives of Turkey were attending the London Conference, convened for the purpose of reconsidering the Treaty. One must confess to a feeling of surprise that Greece, which may without impropriety be termed the lackey of England, should have had the impudence to do this thing. The Prime Minister, by the raising of a finger, could have stopped it. A round of golf with Sir Arthur Crossley would have been ample.

Even if the legacy of Gladstone, with reference to the bundling of the Turk, bag and baggage out of Europe, were indeed a sacred charge laid upon every British Cabinet for all time, that would afford no valid reason for maltreating him in Asia Minor.

So far as the homelands were concerned, the military and financial provisions of the Treaty seemed obviously designed to make the nation bankrupt in both respects; and spelt Turkey's doom as an independent nation.

In the matter of Constantinople, the conditions were even worse. Constantinople is the capital, the seat of government, the residence of the Sultan, and yet Greeks and Armenians are therein permitted to carry on every conceivable kind of intrigue—sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion—and bring Turkish authority into disgrace, under the very noses of the High Commissioners of the Allies.

Was such treatment to be endured? Is it right for a Muslim people to suffer such a degradation?

I appeal to Humanity—and beyond Humanity to practical common sense—and I ask: Were not the Kemalists justified in doing what they have done? The Conference of London accomplished nothing—nothing was even so much as attempted to check the Greeks in their ghastly work. They deliber-

ately advanced beyond the boundaries allotted to them, and not a word was said—not a warning, not a hint given, that such action was not permissible.

Did the Kemalists then do wrong, when they rallied round their hero, and proceeded, under his leadership, to take measures for their own protection? They would have scattered the Greeks months ago, as they have scattered them now, had it not been for the Paris Conference.

That Conference left the financial and military provisions of the Treaty untouched. Lord Curzon's proposals amounted, indeed, to little more than a re-hash of the old document.

The Kemalists tried every means in their power to obtain redress peaceably. They sent their Minister of the Interior, Fethi Bey—a sensible level-headed man, but he met with a markedly cold reception. He was not even allowed an interview by Lord Curzon; and left the country with a note in *The Times*, which would have given more than a hint of what was likely to come, to any Cabinet not obsessed with a perverted self-satisfaction.

Then came the famous speech of Mr. Lloyd George on August 4th; and the booming of the Turkish guns was the reply.

In the name of the British sense of justice

(which, I firmly believe still lives, though many wish it dead) I ask who was responsible for this bloodshed and misery inflicted on innocent and already suffering humanity? It would have set the match to another world-conflagration, and brought to a perpetual end that cordial relationship between the East and the West—without which England cannot remain the England she is to-day—if the soul of England had not awakened at last to the ruinous folly of "the Kaiser of Downing Street."

Tears of blood—and ink—will be shed copiously on the wretched plight of Greeks and Armenians when evacuating Thrace, but the blame must be laid at the doors of those who tried to inflict the rule of the alien few on the indigenous many—a lesson which should not be forgotten in deciding the ultimate destiny of Palestine.

Two things have, however, now become clearly established.

The brutal conduct of the Greeks, on their retirement after defeat, confirms the report of their misdeeds in Thrace and Anatolia. Of what unimaginable things could they not have been capable when flushed with victory if, in defeat, they were guilty of the ghastly excesses which have been irrefutably recorded against them? On the

other hand, the forbearance, to which London War Correspondents have borne testimony, shown by the Turks in their victorious march through the regions populated by their enemies, has cleared them of all the wild charges hurled at them by generation after generation of profiteer and propagandist, for the purpose of the elimination of Turkey from Europe. Wars cannot be waged in the West unless with the consent of the nations involved. The people of Great Britain, for example, cannot be led away by the sudden whim of their leaders for the time being. An opinion must first be created and moulded by careful propaganda work, in order to support the proposed policy. It was more or less with this object, as the East understands the situation, that the last two generations of political and religious writers have deliberately set themselves to traduce a nation whose citizens have always, in the eyes of those who have had the opportunity of knowing them, if report is true, comported themselves as gentlemen.

As to the atrocities alleged to have been perpetrated upon Armenians, the East is faced with the significant fact that, if the numbers of the reported victims in successive Armenian massacres be reckoned up, it will be found that the race must by this

time have become extinct, in their own homeland at least; and yet the friends of the Armenians still claim for them a preponderance in number in Armenia; and on that alleged preponderance, base their sole right to autonomy.

CHAPTER IV

THE AKALI MOVEMENT: AN OBJECT-LESSON

An English peer of the realm, while endorsing my views on the Turkish question and that of the Muslim Indian, wrote to me drawing my attention to what seemed to him to be a flaw in the book—and that flaw was the prominence justice compelled me to give to Mahatma Gandhi. Now, my object in writing these books, which I admit constitutes something of a departure from the usual routine of my pen, is to endeavour to lay before the English public every aspect of the Indian and Muslim mind, and thus to enable them, if they are so disposed, to find some way out of the difficulty which has arisen. It is practically impossible to understand the India of to-day without also understanding something of the teachings and of the ideals of the Mahatma. You cannot dismiss the whole thing by calling the man an incendiary and the rest of it, if he actually holds the foremost place in the hearts and

in the minds of millions. His imprisonment, and that of the Ali Brothers, was quite mistakenly considered to be a breakwater against the rising wave of anti-British feeling. The lull which followed in India was only the calm before the storm. I said so, when the Government Press here, in England, was loud in its praises of the action of the Cabinet in urging the Government of India to clap these "firebrands" into jail. The events of the last four months have only confirmed me in my opinion; and England to-day must brace herself to face a fiercer storm than that which threatened her in the beginning of this year.

Indians have realized that their salvation lies in their own hands. India, though the home of divers religions and civilizations, and therefore a fit place for the policy of "divide and rule," has awakened to the nature of that policy, and is now making a very rapid movement towards unification—a movement which may be well enough for India, but which may also involve a sinister outlook for British interests.

An Act, for example, has already been passed in the Legislative Assembly, which renders valid a marriage between adherents of different religions; thus removing, at a stroke, one of the most effective barriers against national unity. This enactment, with its

inevitable consequences, naturally enough encountered stormy official opposition, which at first received the support of a section of the population, until its eyes were effectually opened by the events of 1920. The melted mountain snows poured down into the torrents, and the torrents swelled the big river which swept away every obstacle, and the law was passed.

Another movement is that which has, within the last three years, been taken up in earnest by high-caste Hindus. Formerly such Hindus would not permit themselves to be touched by certain classes of persons called untouchable. Food and drink could not be taken by a good Hindu, if a Muslim, or any person other than a Hindu, had handled it, or in any way been concerned in its preparation. The very touch of such an one carried with it pollution. The great secret, that a community as regards the things of the stomach and the table is a most powerful factor in creating and fashioning community of mind, dawned on many of the Hindu leaders who were working for the unity of Hindus and Muslims; and to-day I find a very extensive campaign in progress against these time-honoured restrictions of caste. Hindus and Muslims sit at the same table, partake of the same dish, sometimes even from the same plate, and

drink out of the same tumbler. To me it seems little short of a miracle that he impossible of yesterday should have become to-day's reality. And it is, most assuredly, a miracle; but one wrought, not so much by the spell of the Mahatma, as by the incredible indiscretions of Downing Street.

A Hindu girl is not permitted by her religion to marry a Muslim; but many Hindus, more especially in Bengal, have, under the influence, doubtless, of Western ideas, become broad-minded enough to welcome such a matrimonial connection. Family relationship in India is a much closer and more intimate thing than it is here in the West. An alliance by marriage represents in India an alliance of hundreds of families. It constitutes, therefore, the best imaginable agency for the assimilation of strangers; and now the last obstacle in the way of its achievement has been removed by legislative enactment. The gulf between Muslim and Hindu, which in the last century tended to grow ever wider, will now be adequately bridged over, if not quite filled up, before a half of the present century is gone; and an India, thus united, will not be likely to tolerate any foreign rule, if such rule is not clearly for the benefit of the country.

The movements now in peaceful but quite effective operation may differ widely in scope,

origin, and nationality; but whatever these differences may be, each receives support from a united India, and breeds discontent with and disaffection against the British régime. Racial prejudice is rapidly increasing, and if the situation is not generously and tactfully handled the contagion will spread to the native troops.

If to conquer, through submission to evil, be indeed a Christian verity and universal truth, whereby victory can be achieved against persecution coming from quarters however powerful, then the Mahatma, following the footsteps of Jesus, has given the like gospel to his country.

The ethics of Jesus have an application which is, I think, too generally missed. They are not pure idealism, as is maintained by certain Christian writers of the day by way of *apologia*, to explain the utter negation of them which would seem to prevail in the international affairs of Christendom—a negation which cannot but continue so long as the so-called followers of Christ continue to practise that other gospel of dominance and aggression which is too frequently masked by what is termed "a strong foreign policy." If, however, it be conceded—as is conceded by many thinking persons—that the mission of the Master was, in fact, neither universal nor

international, and that consequently his teachings cannot be expected to give any assistance towards the solving of public or international problems, it becomes necessary to seek for its real significance. He was a Jew concerned solely for the Jewish race. It was not his purpose to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs. But the nation he came to redeem was already in subjection, under a foreign yoke. His prophetic eye saw, stretching away before his people, an endless vista of oppression and persecution, with extermination at the end of it. How could he save them from the wrath to come? The gospel—the answer—is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount :—

> But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil : but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.
>
> And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.
>
> And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.
>
> Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away.
>
> Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.
>
> But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.

The like ordinance was laid upon the Indians of old time by certain of the Rishis—the Lord

Buddha among them. It may be, as Nietzsche observes, a kind of slave morality, putting a premium on tyranny and tending to the elimination—later or sooner—of every manly quality from the races practising it; but it is, for all that, the only chance of existence for a nation or a race faced with odds that can never be overcome—in other words, for a nation without hope—when any effort at resistance can only result in further oppression.

India has, from the beginning of time, one might almost say, been a prey to foreign invasion. And yet the Hindus are still the predominant element in the country. In this respect their fate resembles, not a little, that of the Jews. The two ancient races, if they could continue to eke out their existence, to live and even to thrive, have only this same doctrine of submission to evil, to thank for it. The position is, indeed, sufficiently paradoxical. Jesus was followed throughout the course of his teaching by those who rejected him, and to-day, would seem to be rejected, in their actions at least, by those who in name have accepted him.

To meet the difficult situations which nations have to face from time to time —and they say history is repeating itself in India to-day—Muhammad (Peace be upon him and all other Prophets) showed a different

way, inasmuch as the course ordained by the Hindu Rishis—and by Jesus—meant, apparently, death to manliness. By his own example he taught his followers to flee from oppression. Submission to evil or escape from it are, therefore, the two courses contemplated by the followers of Mr. Gandhi.

This brief excursus into the troubled regions of Christian ethics is in no way a diversion from my subject, nor must it be taken as penned in any wantonly controversial spirit. I have sought to bring home to my readers exactly what is the idea that is abroad—namely, that India is the victim of tyranny and oppression, and that submission and flight are the only alternatives by which that tyranny may be escaped. By their submission, or by their flight, your fellow-subjects in India deem themselves to be bearing witness before the whole civilized world that your rule in India is the rule of tyranny and oppression. That, of course, is not so; but latter-day exponents of British policy in India have led the people to believe that it is. The alternative of flight was tried in the year 1919, and the stream of the exodus flowed strongly towards Afghanistan; but the movement was soon checked by the strenuous efforts of certain Muslim leaders, Hakim Ajmal Khan among them. I happened to be in

Idia at the time. The movement has never appealed to me, and I thought I must "do my bit" towards easing the situation. I wrote against it, and found occasion to discuss the matter with the Hakim aforesaid and with others, and it had come to an end before I left the country. But that movement is again in contemplation and on a more serious scale—with the prospect of far-reaching consequences.

Most of the people have now begun to have faith in the effectiveness of the Mahatma's teaching and to accept it as a guiding principle in all their political activities. The political workers have therefore adopted a new *modus operandi*, on the lines laid down by the imprisoned leader, whereby they seek to achieve their purpose without giving any occasion at all for Government interference. The Bardoli tragedy, which was the pretext for Mahatma Gandhi's imprisonment, could never have occurred—so at least thinks the Indian—if the people had exercised absolute self-control, like the Akalis at Amritsar.

Civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes —*Satyagarah*, as it is called—is now generally believed and preached, and will become a reality if the people will only learn to submit to every suffering with patience, and to leave no pretext to the Government for the use of

force. More than 2,000 political workers are now in jail, and those still at liberty have changed their mode of action, which change has been wrongly interpreted as the return of peace or restoration of order—call it what you will. Men have greater faith in silent work than in stirring up disaffection and racial prejudice. These last are already on the increase, and have received automatically a further and powerful impetus from the philo-Hellenistic activities of the late Cabinet.

The new drama of submission to evil had what I may call its dress rehearsal at Amritsar in the beginning of this year. Its purpose was simply that of practising the exercise of self-control under police maltreatment. Here in England it is impossible even to imagine the capability of the Indian police constabulary when it resorts to force. The English policeman is a gentleman, the servant of humanity as well as of Justice—in the highest sense a trustworthy guardian of the peace. He neither invents nor distorts facts, nor fabricates evidence for the purpose of bringing any person within the clutches of the law. His tendency is, as often as not, more to exonerate than to incriminate an accused person; and he takes a pride in being able to discern right from wrong. You will find his exact opposite in the average police constable of India. His temper, once

aroused, is generally out of control; more especially if he be aware of an official eye witnessing his zeal, and is assured of official backing.

To inure themselves to the peculiar methods of this impulsive body, the men of Amritsar came for their dress rehearsal. They came in massed crowds, making the round of the town singing non-co-operation songs with pauses, at different points of their progress, for speeches. Here in London we are familiar with such demonstrations; moreover, the police escort them, and it is very seldom that any untoward incident occurs; in fact, instead of doing any harm, these meetings and processions act as a safety-valve. I may mention that this British method of, I may almost call it precautionary "looking on" was actually tried, with notable success, by the Superintendent of Police at Ferozpur, a town notoriously unruly, and a hotbed of disturbances during those troubled days of 1919.

If the junior officers of the Indian police cannot appreciate the virtue of non-interference on such occasions, the District Magistrates and the Police Superintendents in India, most of whom are English, can hardly fail to be aware of it. But they elect to judge Indian matters by an entirely different standard from that which they would use at home. So report has

it that these Amritsar demonstrations were opposed by the police assembled to disperse them. Many of the demonstrators were harshly treated—some of them bruised and wounded—but when a large number had been injured, and the ranks of the demonstrators had become proportionately thinned, fresh police units, who had been stationed awaiting the demonstration at different points, appeared as reinforcements. The same business was repeated for several days in succession, and then it ended. The administration achieved nothing beyond a larger measure of disaffection; but the followers of the Mahatma got their much-needed experience of the discipline of submission to force. The lesson thus learned was repeated to good purpose in the present Akali movement.

The movement has developed and, I may say, degenerated into a regular scuffle between the Government and the Sikhs. Though it passes under the name of the Akalis, a fanatic Sikh sect, as it is styled here, it has now the support of many influential Sikhs—title-holders and members of the Legislative Council. It is countenanced by almost all educated Sikhs. It has spread to the four corners of India, and will very soon reach Mesopotamia and the Malay Peninsula. Amritsar is the centre of the Sikh religion and—but for the non-

resisting principles I am speaking of—would have again been the scene of a repetition of the *Jallian-walla* Garden tragedy of 1919, under Brigadier-General Dyer.

The movement concerns Sikh shrines and their endowments in the Punjab, the annual proceeds of which amount to an enormous sum. The shrines, from early days, have been under the curatorship of old *Mahants*, who, in the general opinion, are a bad lot, and squander the money; but there has been of late a very strong movement towards education in the community, which has in consequence resolved to utilize the income from these shrines for the education and betterment of the Sikhs. They aim at bringing all the shrines in the country under the administration of a Sikh Board of Management; to dismiss the old *Mahants*, and to appoint new incumbents at a salary. This idea is naturally unpalatable to the old *Mahants*; and the Young Sikhs would strain every nerve to regain the supremacy. The matter is under legislative consideration in the form of the Sikh Shrine Bill, but the larger part of the community will not support the Government, as such support would be contrary to the principles of non-co-operation; which principle has again been emphasized at a mass meeting of more than 20,000 people held on September 10th last.

The Young Sikh party wishes to take possession of the shrines without making use of any such force as may bring their action under police cognizance; and thus to avoid Government interference with their communal affairs. They think that they can do so and remain at the same time free from criminal liability. They will doubtless interfere with the civil rights, if any, of the *Mahants*; but the latter have their remedy in the Civil Courts; and, in the opinion of the Akalis, the movement has so far given no justification for any action on the part of the Government. The police, if apprehensive of a breach of the peace, may move the magistracy to bind over the parties concerned for its maintenance.

The administration of the Punjab could not be in better hands than those of Sir Edward MacLagan; and I am sure that he must have seen reason for Government interference. But, unfortunately, this action has been misconstrued, and it is believed that the Government sees the secret of its power, and the maintenance of its rule in India, in keeping Indians half-educated; and that its support of the *Mahant's* cause is intended to deter the Sikh community from utilizing the shrine proceeds for their betterment, though the Bill that I have mentioned provides, I believe, otherwise.

The Sikh shrines are dotted all over the country, and the Akali section of the community has been deputed to release them from their old curators without contravening the criminal law. They will not give further occasion for the repetition of the regrettable tragedy of the Nankana Sahib, where unarmed Sikhs were shot down, and some of the bodies put in a cauldron of burning oil by the *Mahant* and his party. The victims appear to have been persons taking part in a marriage procession, which passed the shrine on its way to the house of the bride in another village, and halted there to rest. They were mistaken for members of the Young Sikh party who had come there to evict the *Mahant*, who with his associates met a well-deserved penalty as the result of a judicial inquiry; but the ghastly crime could hardly fail to intensify, though without any justification, existing ill-feeling against the Government, added to which further suspicion was aroused through the mishandling of the police investigation, which at first seemed inclined to accept the story of the *Mahant*. The Sikhs are well organized, and know how to rally to the cause wherever they may happen to be; and within two months, what had happened was known throughout the world. I saw Sikhs in Singapore and other chief towns of the Malay Penin-

sula with black turbans on their heads as a sign of national mourning, and loud in their expressions of resentment.

And now the Akalis, having set themselves the task of restoring the Sikh shrines to proper management, are, as I have said, determined to accomplish that purpose without resorting to force; and so a few months ago they resumed operations by travelling from place to place; but experiencing difficulties in proceeding by rail, they, without remonstrance, continued their campaign on foot. Stages were arranged, and *Lungers* (arrangements for providing meals without charge) were established at each halting-place. I omit minor details of the movement, and come to its last development. There is a big shrine in *Guru-ka-Bagh* in Amritsar, and according to old custom, the Sikh devotees used to go thither to cut wood for use in the *Lungers*.

At the end of last August the Akalis went in the direction of the shrine for that purpose. On their way they encountered police obstruction, which resulted in their being beaten—flogged. The Akalis, bound by the principles of Gandhiism, took the flogging without resistance and returned home. The next night saw a repetition of the occurrence. Many nights thus passed; then men of position and responsibility attended to bear testimony, and so

reason with the police authorities against their illegal interference. Among these was the famous Moderate leader, Pundit Madan Mohan Maulvia. He saw two *Naib Tahsildars* (third-class magistrates) at the head of the police force, waiting to obstruct the Akalis. The Pundit informed the officials that they could not use force unless there was an infringement of the law, nor could they obstruct the Akalis on their way to the shrine without any legal warrant. No heed was taken, and maltreatment began. Then came the great mass meeting of September 10th, which saw more than 20,000 people in *Jallian-walla* Garden. Resolutions were passed, but the conspicuous feature of the movement, the consequences of which should not be under-estimated, was its representative character. Though the Akalis have been dubbed fanatics, yet the whole of Upper India responded to the call.[1] A Muslim and a Hindu, were the mover and seconder respectively of the resolution. The Akalis, it need hardly be said, won considerable kudos by reason of their plucky forbearance and self-restraint; while the action of the police was universally condemned, and any appeal to the Government for redress was received thenceforward with marked disfavour. The Akalis then resolved, according

[1] See page 97.

to the *Vakil*, the Amritsar daily paper, to send 100 fresh men every night, even if the police continued to belabour them. They were prepared to suffer gladly any amount of physical injury. The persons disabled by the police were to be replaced by others. The authorities could not cope with the situation, and thought it better to wait for the coming season of harvest, when the gathering in of the crops would make another call to the Akalis; all of which serves to show the hopeless position of the administration.

But the situation is becoming ever more acute, and I fear that I can detect a great deal more in the following extract from *The Times* of October 26th than the average reader can be expected to see. *Lumbardar*, I would point out, means headman of a village, and under a *Zaildar* there are usually several *Lumbardars*, which means a company the numbers of which are unaffected by the call of the coming harvest :—

Although the *Gurdwara* (Shrines) Committee deny that they are attempting to seduce the Army and other Government servants, the Akali (Sikh fanatics) situation has taken a serious turn since the entry of the military pensioners into the struggle. *Jathas* (bands) of *Lumbardars* (cultivators) and *Zaildars* (graduates) are said to be making preparations, and the extremist daily newspapers are vigorously appealing to the *Khalsa* (collegians) to prepare themselves for what they style the " Mission of *Granth* " (Sikh Holy Book).

Violent speeches are being made daily at *Jallianwala Bagh* (the scene of General Dyer's firing) portending developments of a dangerous character.

You must find some quite different method of ruling a people who can rise to the spirit of martyrdom, even on occasions such as these. The Sikhs have faith in their cause, and are willing to suffer—if called upon, to die for it. I have already laid special stress on this phase of Indian psychology.[1] I have emphasized the very urgent necessity of devising a policy which will be, in some measure at least, consistent with it; and have cited the opinion of Sir Hamilton Grant on the point. Anyone who, like Sir Hamilton, has studied the mind of India, must needs come to the same conclusion, and I would advise every Englishman interested in the stability of his country's rule in India, to keep in view the well-weighed words of the ex-Chief Commissioner of the Northern Indian Frontier Province.

A quite recent case at Amritsar, where 101 Sikh pensioners have been arrested and sentenced, furnishes a further and very apposite example of the same psychology at work. Touching these pensioners, *The Times* correspondent wired from Lahore on October 28th:—

In a written statement the accused recounted their service on battlefields and sufferings in the war, and

[1] *India in the Balance*, chap. vi.

complained that the Government had violated their pledges of neutrality in religious matters. They regarded themselves as fortunate in being arrested.

These affairs of Amritsar have produced, and are producing a very grave effect on the whole Sikh community; so much so, that the Sikh units in the British Army were on the verge of revolt, as admitted even by the Simla correspondent of *The Times* in its issue of October 4th, had it not been for the timely efforts of the Sikh Shrine Committee in the matter.

I have given a plain statement of facts in order to awaken the people here to the truth, that these incidents, though they may be lightly explained away by the Administration, cannot be treated lightly by the people of Great Britain. They are the links in the chain of events which is in process of being forged every day, and which as it grows longer becomes ever more and more of an obstacle in the path of British rule. The labours of the last thirty years to win the Sikh community, and to separate them from their fellow-Indians, is lost. A country like India, populated by different races, lends itself, perhaps, to such occurrences as I have related; but the unfortunate feature of the situation is, that the Government becomes, or is taken to be, involved in the affair. Quarrels and incidents

between Hindus and Muslims may be, in the nature of things, common enough, but now they are regarded, wrongly, as engineered by the Government in order to widen the gulf between communities, whose concord is thought to be undesirable. The Moplah affair has given rise to the same kind of insinuation.

The Government could justify its conduct in the eye of the country, if it had to deal with one community and the rest remained aloof, but to-day every event, in whatsoever community it may happen, tends to union and the presenting of a united front on the part of India against the Government. People are stirred up—incensed against the Government. They lose their cool-headedness and saner judgment; and thus a new link of alienation from Great Britain, is added to the chain which has already become too heavy.

CHAPTER V

NON-CO-OPERATION

NON-CO-OPERATION is the second article of faith in Ghandiism. The principle, in a comprehensive form, is enjoined in the Holy Qur-án. Man's natural instinct towards sociableness and intercourse with his fellow-men, which is one of the corollaries of existence, makes a certain measure of mutual interdependence a necessity, humanly speaking; and from that necessity springs, naturally, Co-operation. On the other hand, less commendable forms of human activity, such as tyranny and evil-doing, stand likewise in need of co-operation, if they are to be shaped to any purpose. Hence a religion, if it be a religion from God, should teach us where co-operation is useful and right, and where it is mischievous and wrong. The Qur-án has answered this question in the following passage, which is clear enough to need no commentary :—

> And co-operate with one another in goodness and piety and do not co-operate with one another in sin and aggression (chap. v, ver. 2).

No good citizen—be he Muslim or other—can consciously and conscientiously co-operate with any system of government that is conducive to tyranny and oppression. Mahatma Ghandi styles the present form of government in India, a government of tyranny and oppression; and those Muslims who are of his following do likewise. Neither he nor the Muslim leaders of the movement bear any grudge against His Majesty the King, or against his rule in India; and I have every reason to believe them to be sincere in what they say; but they do take exception to the present form of that rule. I do not propose, nor do I feel myself qualified, to discuss that aspect of the question here; but of this I am convinced, that there must be a radical alteration in the existing system of government, or else the existing system must proceed to vindicate itself, as a just and righteous dispensation, by wiser and more practical methods than those employed by the present Publicity Institution, which has recently been established in India for propaganda purposes.

This Institution carries no weight at all. Those who work for it are looked upon with contempt as traitors to their country; they are hooted down whenever they appear in public; and, quite lately, a head of the department in one of the provinces, was compelled

to resign his office as secretary to a great national educational institution which receives financial help, to the extent of £2,000 annually, from the Government. Story-books written by the staffs of the Publicity Committees in India are used as text-books in many of the primary schools, possibly with the notion of teaching "the young idea how to shoot" in a manner and direction favourable to the Government. But the policy has not hitherto been a success.

I remember once at Simla, in 1919, seeing a child of twelve with one of these books, which he had brought home from school. I asked him what it was about. He put his finger on the author's name, on the title-page of the book, and said with a smile, "He is a *jholi chúch* (a lackey) of the Government." This incident will enable the reader to form a fairly accurate idea of the esteem in which the efforts of the Publicity Committees are held in India. The cause of the Government, if a good one, should be advocated by men who are independent; and, at least where Muslims are concerned, its literature should be based on Qur-ánic teaching, which constitutes a binding duty for the Muslim, and contains material sufficient to support any and every imaginable system or institution, that is in any way conducive to the public weal.

In the dark days of 1919 the Government of the Punjab found it necessary to have recourse to a number of Qur-ánic verses, condemning sedition and political disturbances. Posters and placards bearing such Qur-ánic quotations, affixed to the walls of towns, and scattered from aeroplanes, had an excellent effect; the only damaging feature in connection with them being their origin, as indicated by the name of the Publicity Committee, printed at the foot of the page.

Those who think that the Non-Co-operation movement is on the wane are mistaken. It has been tried in a variety of forms during the last few years, but some of them proved to be either premature or ineffective, and were rejected; which circumstance has been taken by opportunists in England as an indication of the failure of the movement. But the movement has not failed. On the contrary, it is working in a way which will be in the highest degree detrimental to British labour and capital; and may, in the long run, cripple the wealth and stability of the Empire. To make the situation more clear, and to show that the Muslim portion of India has been, and is, its most important factor, a brief sketch of the movement and its history will be necessary.

It began in the late nineties in the form of

Swadeshi—or the boycotting of foreign goods—in Bengal. Its progress was but slow, and the Government, by the help of the Muslims, with the late Nawab Salimulla Khan of Dacca at their head, contrived to make it something of a fiasco. It was dying a natural death, when Mahatma Gandhi came to revive it; but even then it was not until the Muslims rallied round the flag of Gandhi, when they had utterly lost faith in the Government after the Treaty of Sèvres, that it attained anything like the vital force of reality.

That Treaty has proved to be a turning-point in the history of India. It marks definitely the alienation of the Muslim element of India from its old-time devotion to British rule; and those who are, in deed and in truth, interested in the reconciling of Islam—and I see signs of a British awakening to this vital necessity to the maintenance and stability of their rule in India and elsewhere—have a clear signpost to direct them in the right way.

Mr. Gandhi, backed by the Muslims in his campaign of non-co-operation, set out in his programme a number of items, such as Government service, legislative councils, education, emigration from India, and the boycotting of British goods. Some of these items were a mistake, others suicidal; and these were dropped speedily at the outset. Some, again,

were regarded as premature, or unwise, and gave rise to divergences of opinion; but the last of them—the boycotting of British goods —never aroused any diversity of opinion. There are very few people in India, even among the so-called Moderates, who, though differing with Mr. Gandhi, would dare to oppose him in any effective manner, because they all believe in his sincerity and in his hold on the public mind.

His imprisonment has not improved matters, from the point of view of the Administration; seeing that it has made him—in the eyes of the people—a martyr for the Truth.

Co-operation in the Legislative Council was, however, deemed advisable in order to show a united front to any Government measure which the country might consider to be against its interests. The recent decision of the Legislative Assembly in refusing the increase in military expenditure proposed in the Budget, and the vote of censure on Mr. Lloyd George lately passed by them, show that the followers of Mr. Gandhi saw that the object of non-co-operation might on occasion be better served by co-operation. At present there are some elements in the Assembly which may or may not side with the Government, but efforts have already been made, and will continue to be made, to

return by election to the Assembly only such members as can be relied upon to oppose the Government when necessary. The Government of India is not unaware of the situation. The Viceroy, in his somewhat thankless efforts to justify the pronouncements of the Premier, said, in effect, that that gentleman was simply striving to avert the very danger of which I am speaking.[1]

Some idea of the possibilities of action latent in such an Assembly, may be gleaned from the example of the Lahore Municipality, which refused to give any sort of welcome or address to the Prince of Wales on his tour in India, and can, in fact, do what it likes, in a manner that is perfectly legitimate, but most damaging to the prestige of the Government. Its strength is shown most clearly in the return of its nominees at election time. It is not the constituency, but the Non-Co-operation Committee, which nominates and secures the return of members and governs the elections. The growth of such a body to control future elections to the Legislative Assembly and Council was, until recently, only a probability; but the speech of the ex-Premier has given it impetus, and it is now a reality. He threw the whole population of India into an abyss of smouldering anger; and, for sheer

[1] See *The Times*, November 6th.

exasperation, most of the Moderates became converted into Extremists. The day is not far off, I am afraid, when the Legislative Councils will have become flooded with people of one mind, bent on opposing every Government measure, and always on constitutional lines.[1]

The plank in Mr. Gandhi's platform which has proved universally popular is, as I have stated, the boycott of foreign goods. The whole country, with the exception only of the nobility and the Muslim gentry, has given it whole-hearted support. Most of the leaders, who are skilful enough to evade the clutches of the law, are touring in different parts of the country, preaching *Swadeshi*. Mrs. Gandhi, Mrs. Mohammed Ali and the mother of the Ali Brothers (these ladies are called "Mothers of India" and command the very greatest respect throughout the country), with many other ladies of influence, like Mrs. Nehru and Mrs. Das, are doing the same. They not only hold public meetings, but go into the *zenanas* and easily make converts among the female folk, where the male members of the family, in Muslim households especially, are averse to native products.

All this means that the coming generation will become devoted to the *Swadeshi* move-

[1] See *The Times*, November 6th.

ment. Pundit Moti Lal Nahru, who, by reason of his high abilities, was perfectly qualified for the post of governor of a province in India under the new scheme, had he been in the good books of the Government, is now, I am told, going from house to house in Allahabad as a hawker, vending *Khadi* at a few pence a yard. His example will be followed by many. Here is a most eloquent, a most effective and convincing, but, at the same time, a silent oration in condemnation of foreign goods, and one entirely free from legal peril.

On occasions of marriages, where the dowry and wedding presents formerly consisted purely of foreign goods, and cost, in many cases, hundreds of pounds, indigenous products are now in urgent demand; and it very often happens that all those taking part in the bridal procession, including the bridegroom, are wearing the native *khadi*; while the bride is considered to be most becomingly arrayed if she elects to wear the same stuff—which costs but a few shillings—as her wedding dress. Public speakers often get a hostile reception, and in some cases are hooted down, if they are wearing English clothes. In my own case, when I was invited to address a mass meeting at Lahore on the Caliphate question, I deemed it expedient to decline

for that very reason. Let those people in England, whose interest lies in either misrepresenting the real situation in India, or in minimizing its gravity, consider these examples of the silent working of the Non-Co-operation movement. If "more markets for British goods" is the cry that inspires imperial policy in England, that policy must fail utterly in India if non-co-operation continues to develop and spread.

The phase of the movement which applies to the Government service has not appealed much to the public, except as regards the police and the military departments, and here but partially; but the Karachi trial of the Ali Brothers, and the present Akali movement, have been most successful in "speeding it up."

The Government service, in popular credence, gags the voice of liberty; and the Government of India, through its measures and enactments, has proved that popular credence is, in this case, not far out. Every public servant, in compliance with restrictions laid down in a Government circular, has been forbidden to take an active part in any public function. Those who attend such meetings as members of the audience, are looked at askance, and sometimes receive private censure from their official chiefs. Even the pro-

fession of the Bar, independent as it is, has not succeeded in keeping itself entirely free from the effects of the Government measures. Those who qualify themselves for the profession in Indian Universities, must renew their licence for practice annually. In the year 1911, and again in 1912, I saw a new provision for the granting of such licences, under which the petitioner was required to declare his willingness to abstain from certain political activities. I cannot say if the clause remains.

But Mr. Gandhi looks at the matter from a different angle. A very large proportion of the Indian population is in the public service, which therefore, in his opinion, not only has killed Indian industry and commerce, but has proved itself to be a veritable bone of contention for Hindus and Muslims. They snarl and bristle at each other over it like a couple of quarrelsome terriers, and it serves as an excellent distraction for alienating their sympathies and interest from the cause of their country; and this is true not only of the individual in the public service, but of others, the members of his family. Hence the verdict of Mr. Gandhi was given against Government service; but inasmuch as, at present, there is no alternative opening in prospect, to resign from such service is a course which many

cannot afford to adopt. Still, I have noticed a rising aversion to it in the ranks of the educated classes; and nowadays the average young man, fresh from the University, prefers to go into business rather than serve under the Government.

If the object of the Karachi case [1] was to remove the Ali Brothers from public activity, there was enough material in their speeches, other than those complained of, to bring

[1] The trial was not, unfortunately, free from some farcical aspects which showed that the conviction of the accused was intended from the first. Even before the case came to the court of the committing magistrate, the sessions judge, who had to try the case finally, if the magistrate considered it one for committal, was found to be in search of some bigger place in which to hold the trial, on the ground that the Sessions House at Karachi could not provide sufficient accommodation. It is said—I do not know with what truth—that people in this country often ignore things of importance, merely because they have been led to believe that the persons concerned therein are of humble origin. Such is not the case with the two Brothers. They come from an excellent family of the State of Rampur—a family which, I think, ranks second to the ruling family. Mohammed Ali is a graduate of Oxford University, and filled a post of responsibility in the State of Baroda before entering public life. Lord Hardinge, when Viceroy of India, went so far as to admit his abilities by describing him as an excellent journalist, while Lord Meston, when Governor of the United Province, did not disdain, if my memory is correct, to invite him as a guest to Government House.

them to book. The Indian Government could not have committed a more serious blunder than that of making the resolution of the Karachi Khilafat Conference, which was moved, seconded and supported by the two Brothers and the other co-convicts in the case, the ground of action. The trial gave wide publicity to the matter, and brought to the notice of the Muslim soldier a thing which had been either unknown or forgotten by him. The Treaty of Sèvres brought home to the Indian Muslim a certain injunction of the Qur-án that forbids Muslim to use the sword against Muslim.[1] He saw a Muslim Power brought to ruin, a ruin, in part at least, of his making, inasmuch as he had taken part in the war against Turkey. It is true that he did so only after the Premier had given a very distinct pledge as to the integrity of the Turkish homelands, and various other matters; but when the pledge was broken, he saw in it simply a punishment for his sin against the Qur-án.

The Karachi Khilafat Conference passed a resolution, just after the Treaty, forbidding Muslims to join the military service, because the Government had employed that service against a Muslim Power. A religious edict was also issued by certain of the Ulemas (the Muslim religious leaders) to the same

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. iv, ver. 92.

effect. This was conspicuous enough, but even this was well on its way to oblivion when the Government made its biggest blunder. The Karachi trial was instituted and a very serious point at once arose—the Law of the Government versus the Qur-án.

The Conference Resolution, which was the subject of the charge, was, to all intents and purposes, only an amplification of a verse of the Qur-án, which, in fact, constituted the defence; and I can honestly say that, though the conviction was of course secured, the prosecution and the judge absolutely failed to meet this part of the defence. Then the movement took a new turn. The purport of the resolution, with the impression that the Law of the Government meant interference with the Muslim religion, went to the four corners of the country. Every big town had its mass meeting of thousands of people, who gave their support to the resolution by passing it again, word for word. The religious edict referred to was reprinted in millions and published broadcast; while the Government looked helplessly on. So much for what the Muslims did. As for the Hindus, their leaders met in Bombay soon after the trial and passed a similar decree.

Now comes the Akali movement. The best Sikh brain and culture have combined to

frame the scheme, and have set to work on lines which they think should render them free from interference on the part of the police and the law. Yet they find their object thwarted by the unwarranted (as they think) interference of the Government, through the police. It should not be forgotten that the Sikhs and the Muslims are chiefly employed in the police and the military service, though the personnel of the police used against the Akalis consists mostly of Hindus and Muslims; but the event is making a very grave impression on the Indian mind—an impression that, unless they give up police and military service altogether, one nationality will be used against another.

Officials at Whitehall are meeting to consider the increase of military expenditure in the Indian Budget—though there will be a deficit of some *crores* of rupees—and the loan to meet it has already been arranged; but if the Non-Co-operation movement in the matter of police and military services becomes popular, where will they get the men for the Army? It is only the proximity of Afghanistan which induces certain Hindu members of the Legislative Assembly to support the military budget for the defence of the country. Afghanistan is, after all, a Muslim country, and if the gravity of the problem is not thoroughly

appreciated, and some measures adopted for the reconciliation of India, the position will, should the contingency arise, be not without difficulty. The Extremists, whose numbers are increasing, are with the Muslims in this; and if the police ranks become also depleted as a result of non-co-operation, the road to *Satyagarah* (civil disobedience) will be an easy one.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER

DURING the past few months I have received many inquiries from responsible quarters, asking me if I could make definite suggestions. I have no pretensions to statecraft, nor to any great ability in properly approaching such problems. One thing, however, I can say without the least hesitation. Apart from the fact that lurks in the truism that it is always easier to get into trouble than out of it, the nation which has been conducting with a considerable degree of success the affairs of a great Empire, ought to experience no serious difficulty in finding some way out. The obstacle, to my mind, lies in absence of knowledge rather than lack of good will. Remove the ignorance—let the nation realize actually what has happened and what is happening—and the battle is already more than half won.

It is unfortunate that Britain should not have been able—after a long reign of a century and a half over India—to come to a real

nderstanding and appreciation of the feelings and susceptibilities of her subjects. This, to my mind, has in the main been responsible for all the trouble. The youthful Civil Servant embarks for India to shoulder the burden of administration. A few hazy ideas, largely inaccurate and entirely misleading, constitute the whole stock of his knowledge concerning the country and its people. He spends almost a lifetime there—twenty-five to thirty years perhaps—but does he come back a wiser man in his understanding of the country? The information he contrives to gather during his sojourn there, and to bring home with him, is, in many cases, hearsay. He has few opportunities of intercourse with the people; of feeling their pulse, as it were, with his own fingers, or acquiring first-hand knowledge of any but the most primitive sort.

Perhaps the Home Government would not have committed the blunders that have been laid to its charge had the true nature of the Caliphate unrest been accurately represented to it by the Government of India. There is reason to believe that Lord Chelmsford's Administration failed in this respect, and it may well be that their report of the matter was stated in a manner so misleading as to minimize entirely the gravity of the case. I do not know in what light the situation was

made to appear to the Government of Mr Lloyd George; and how far the latter understood or misunderstood it. What followed, however, affords much room for misgiving. Mr. Lloyd George rounded upon Indian Muslims with the fury of a capricious schoolmaster, rod in hand, as if to cow a class of silly or mischievous dunces.

Movements in India spring up, grow, develop and assume alarming proportions with the utmost rapidity. But all that the people here know about them, is confined to a fragmentary telegraphic report here and there. Such a half-hearted interest in the vital concerns of the Empire will not do. Take the case of the present Akali movement, which I have dealt with in a previous chapter. It has now become an All-India question. The whole of India is taking interest in it, and what does the average Englishman know about it ?

It is worth while to remember that for the past thirty years the Government of India has adopted every possible measure to create a distinct and separate consciousness among the Sikhs. The Khalsa College was started at their religious centre, Amritsar, for the purpose of fostering their separatist tendencies. Their shrine, Durbar Sahib, was purged of every vestige of Hindu worship. They

are granted special privileges in the Punjab Provincial Services. The services of Mr. Macoliffe were retained for a number of years to translate their sacred books—*Guru Garanth Sahib*—into English. And all this was done in the sure and certain hope that the Government might rely, in emergency, on the loyal support of that community.

In their devotion to the Government they came, of all Indian communities, next only to the Gurkhas. In case of trouble with Pathans, in particular, the Government counted upon their unflinching loyalty, and the *Saragarhi* Memorial at Amritsar bears witness to this fact.

But to-day a misguided policy has brought to nothing, in a moment, the labours of full thirty years. To-day the selfsame Sikh community has been goaded to a state of bloodless war against the Government, and—which is all the more alarming—people at home neither realize, nor care to realize, the gravity of the thing. I have devoted a separate chapter to the causes, development and possibilities of the Akali movement. I have confined myself to a plain statement of facts, leaving it to the reader to form his own conclusions. I have simply given a sketch of the situation as it stands. The reader may read therein for himself the elements which won for

the Akalis the sympathies of the rest of India.

Whatever the justification or otherwise of the Akali campaign, it gives the police (so India thinks) no right whatsoever to utilize its present methods of repression. The law of the land forbids them; in fact, no moral, no humane law could justify the brutal treatment meted out to these people. The Indian vernacular newspapers print pitiable accounts of the ruthless persecution of the Akalis, who are belaboured like cattle and subjected to every conceivable kind of ignominy. And, naturally enough, the sympathy of the whole of India has been aroused, so that the Indian National Congress has even gone so far as to appoint a Committee of Enquiry to report on the situation. The Committee consists of the following prominent Indians:—Mr. Srinavasa Aiyangar, ex-Advocate-General, Madras (President); Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta, Barrister-at-Law, Bengal; Mr. M. V. Abhounkar, Barrister-at-Law, Central Provinces; Mr. S. E. Stokes, Kotgarh; Mr. Mohammed Taqi, Barrister-at-Law, Delhi; and Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni, M.A. (Secretary).

By way of imitation, or emulation, or whatever you prefer to call it, of this National Committee of Enquiry, it occurred to the Government also to start an enquiry. Corre-

spondence in this connection between the Police Inspector-General and the Secretary of the Provincial Congress Committee, Mr. Mohammed Shariff, may be of interest to the reader.

The Inspector-General's letter, dated September 21st, to Mr. Mohammed Shariff was as follows :—

It appears from reports published in the *Tribune* that you can give me valuable evidence in connection with the enquiry I have instituted concerning the alleged excesses of the Police against the Akalis. Therefore I invite you to co-operate with me in this matter. Will you let me know if you are prepared to give your evidence ? If so, may I request you to please see me at the Circuit House ?

Mr. Mohammed Shariff replied :—

Upon my arrival back to Lahore I received your letter of the 21st, for which I thank you. I was an eye-witness of the Police excesses against the Akalis, and so you are quite right in thinking that I am in a position to give you valuable evidence in that connection. I am, however, appearing as a witness before the Congress Committee of Enquiry, *for I believe that this is the only Committee before which an Indian can appear as such with confidence and due regard to self-respect. I have little faith in the justice of British courts and a Committee of Enquiry by the bureaucracy, especially in a case of political or semi-political nature. In the case in question I do not think you can conduct an impartial enquiry.* So far as I know, you had the opportunity to see with your eyes the Akalis being thrashed, but you refrained from any interference. Anyhow, I have already submitted my

statement to the Congress Committee, and you can have a copy of it from that Committee should you choose to.

The correspondence brings to light certain very significant facts. In the first place, it shows that the police authorities, who had the power to check the excesses of their subordinates, were not unaware of what was going on. It further shows to what extent the Indian mind has grown suspicious of all Government measures. The National Committee, comprising men of position and ability and integrity, is obviously beyond all impeachment. Whatever its findings, its verdict in regard to police irregularities can safely be predicted. Patent as these are, they will, without doubt, be deplored and condemned by the Committee. But what of the effect on the mind of India? It can only be a further deepening of the conviction that the Government is determined to tyrannize over the people by any means at their disposal, fair or foul.

I may be wrong in my conclusion, but it is my earnest desire that the people of England should shake off their indifference to Indian affairs. If only they would try to get true information through disinterested sources—if only the columns of the Press would give more prominence to, and welcome discussion on, Indian affairs and the Indian point of

view—nay, if the Press would but use its vast educative influence, even by the lighter methods of the picture and the chatty paragraph, to give that great Empire its due prominence in the public eye—I think it would be at least a first step in the right direction.

They would then, in a very short space of time, be in a position to formulate any policy they might think fit. I can look for no real understanding of any suggestion that I may feel called upon to make regarding Eastern affairs, unless and until the facts, on which that suggestion is based, are known to and understood by the public of Great Britain.

In my opinion, the Indian situation is by no means past cure. Lack of knowledge and a paucity of imagination, are at the root of all the trouble. There are not a few able publicists in England who are capable of doing full justice to Indian problems, were it not for the unfortunate tendency, which seems to prevail even among the most broad-minded, towards special pleading—the marshalling and, almost, the tinting of facts, to induce them to harmonize with a preconceived picture. I have seen some recent books and articles on Indian unrest, and have noticed that they are one and all found wanting in the same essential—disinterestedness. Generally speaking, their writers write with a purpose; to

achieve which, necessitates the over-emphasis of some events, and the minimizing of others. And India is of precisely the same opinion on the subject of the Commissions that are sent out there from time to time. They take with them a programme cut-and-dried, and their questions are framed with reference to the particular end in view. The list of witnesses to be called for evidence is also drawn up beforehand, with the same object. And it is said that some of these are given actual coaching as to what they have to say; with something like a rehearsal thrown in, before their final appearance.

How far these allegations are correct I cannot say; but one conclusion is irresistible and obvious: the English people should not attach too great a value to such Commissions in future, for, in the nature of things, it is unlikely that they will succeed ever in eliciting the truth.

Ignorance is the enemy—ignorance indicative of the barrier set between two peoples; ignorance inducing neglect and indifference of Great Britain towards India, and ignorance breeding suspicion and distrust of India towards your country. Nothing but knowledge—engendering mutual understanding and consequently sympathy and goodwill—can remove it.

CHAPTER VII

THE CALIPHATE IN ISLAM

THE Caliphate in Islam, is neither an outcome of the present tension between Islam and England, nor is it a subterfuge for political propaganda against the British Government, or in favour of the Turks. It is, on the contrary—as the Qur-án says—a Divinely-promised institution, and came into existence just after the death of the Prophet. It served to maintain the stability of Islam, and preserved the integrity of the Qur-án, keeping it free from all the corruption and human interpolation which has affected every other religion, and every other sacred book. Is it, then, surprising to find that we Muslims are determined to spare no effort in maintaining this Caliphate inviolate?

Look at any religion in the world, and at any Book revealed from God to any nation. Are they existing to-day in their original integrity? Do we know anything of Jesus, except a few homilies, a few prayers, a few curses, and a few miracles? The genuineness

of the Bible is admittedly questionable. We know very little of the religion that was taught by the Persian prophet Zoroaster. The same may be said of Buddha and Confucius. The Vedas, from which arose Hinduism, have shared a like fate. In fact, we know nothing of any prophet, or of his actions, which may guide us in our daily life and acts, as an example. Their lives are enveloped in mystery that is akin to mythology. Hence the manifold variety of sects, differing from each other even in fundamental principles, which is the marked characteristic of every other religion; because no religion except Islam has preserved the original teaching of its founder. Is there any community of belief, sufficient for salvation, here, in the two great divisions that claim a common Christianity—Roman Catholic and Protestant? And which of the two can claim to be after the teaching of the Master—of which teaching we may be said to know but little, seeing that the very record of it is lacking in authenticity? Islam, and Islam only, brings to us the revealed Book—the Qur-án—in its original purity. But for the Qur-án, Divine Revelation would have been a myth. Some may think that this superiority of Islam over other religions is principally evidenced by the fact that it is the religion of only thirteen hundred years;

but the religion of Jesus became a patchwork of sects and sub-sects, even within two or three hundred years after Him; and that for want of a record of the real teaching of the Master. The same is true of the teachings of Buddha.

The corruption which overtook these religions, came, too, from yet another cause. Their birthplace was overrun by foreign invaders. The land that was the cradle of faith, was trampled beneath the feet of those who held a different faith, a different civilization and culture. The histories of Persia, India, and Judæa bear testimony to it. Could Islam have come to us in its original purity if Arabia had been the scene of foreign invasion? Could those scenes and places which in themselves are an eloquent narrative of the Prophet's life, have been preserved to us, if Mecca and Medina had passed under a foreign sway?

But Islam owes its integrity to another cause also—to wit, the language of the Qur-án, and of the narratives of the Prophet's actions and words, which has, through the centuries, remained free from corruption. No other language to-day can claim the purity of its original form, like Arabic; and this same purity of the Arabic tongue is, in its turn, to be ascribed to freedom from foreign invasion.

Muhammad (Peace be upon him and all

other Prophets) was not unaware of the fate that too often awaits the outward forms of religion. He was anxious concerning the preservation of his teachings for the coming generations. No human effort could achieve this, but the assurance came from God in these words:

> Surely We have revealed the Reminder and We will most surely be its guardian.[1]

Further, he was assured that the birthplace of Islam should remain immune from the foreign element.[2] The institution of Pilgrimage came into existence under Divine injunction; so that Muslims from all parts of the world may visit Mecca and Medina, and see, with their own eyes, the scenes of the Prophet's life, and find the tradition, the Book, and the language, each in its pristine form. But all this could only be secured through the instrumentality of a temporal kingdom, and that kingdom was promised to us under the name of the Caliphate, in the following words of the Qur-án:

> Allah has promised to those of you who believe and do good that He will most certainly make them *rulers*

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xv, ver. 9.

[2] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xcv, ver. 3; chap. xxviii, ver. 57.

in the earth as He made *rulers* those before them, and that He will most certainly establish for them their religion which He has chosen for them, and that He will most certainly, after their fear, give them security in exchange; they shall serve Me, not associating aught with Me; and whoever *is ungrateful* after this, these it is who are the transgressors.[1]

Am I here simply theorizing—indulging in an academical discussion? Or am I stating truth borne out by facts and history? Will not a Muslim heart bleed when, after thirteen centuries, the very institution to which we owe the stability and purity of Islam and the Qur-án, is in peril? The land which should have remained untrodden by non-Muslim feet, has lost that sacredness. The last words of the Prophet were to this effect, and we find his request put to naught after the war.

The country of Hedjaz is the place of Islam, which means Peace; but where is the peace now in Arabia? The Wahabis and the people of Hedjaz are fighting against each other; and is it not a surprising thing to note, that both Ibn Saud, the chief of the Wahabis, and King Hussain, are both in receipt of money from England, as the outcome of the amazing diplomacy of the Coalition Cabinet? What must the Muslims in India think of England when they read in an Indian weekly—the

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xxiv, ver. 55.

Medina of Bijnaur—that the army of King Hussain found an English officer, in Arab dress, commanding the Wahabis, among the prisoners of war ?

Could a person with an atom of sense in his head, after what I have said, call the Caliphate movement political propaganda of recent growth ? It is not difficult to understand our attachment to Turkey. The Muslims in India, and elsewhere, would rather go to any extreme, I am afraid, than see Turkey reduced to a condition that would disable her from performing the onerous duties of the Caliphate. Whatever may be your imperial policy, we Muslims are the most numerous of all the subjects of the Empire, and our interests should receive proportionate consideration. The Caliphate is a religious, and a purely religious, institution ; to it the Pilgrimage—one of the Five Pillars of Islam—is inseparably attached ; and do not forget that a Muslim will make every sacrifice for his religion.

The Caliphate, in certain of its aspects, is a religious institution ; but in essence it is one and the same with temporal power ; so much so that the word " Khilafat "—or " Caliphate," as it is generally written in English, meaning literally " successor "—has come to be regarded as a synonym for temporal rule ; and this

you will find in any Arabic lexicon. The learned author of the *Spirit of Islam* has dealt very ably with the question in the new edition of his famous work.

The Caliphate, which is in fact a temporal power, has a religious implication, in so far as a number of religious ends are bound up with it. The Caliph is regarded as the religious head of the Muslim world, and it is essential that he be a righteous man; but let this not be misunderstood to mean that he is invested with anything of a sacramental character. He is just as much a member of the Universal Muslim Brotherhood as the humblest Muslim, but no more. The mere fact that the mantle of the Caliphate has fallen on his shoulders, does not automatically transmute him into something sacred. No sanctity whatsoever is attached to his person merely on that account, as is commonly believed in the West; nor does any Muslim seek a spiritual elevation in obeying the Caliph, as do the adherents of the Pope in obeying his behests. Such a view is an insult to a Muslim's sense of religion. Islam is from first to last a democratic religion; and it is from his religion that a Muslim learns democracy. Five times a day, in the mosque, he sees democracy illustrated in practice. Neither birth, nor rank, nor wealth has any precedence

in the presence of the Lord. There are no reserved pews in the church of Islam. Front seats cannot be bought for money or position. Whosoever comes the earlier has the prior claim. Rich and poor, high and low, prince and peasant—all stand in the same row, on the same carpet, shoulder to shoulder, bowing and prostrating before their common Father in Heaven. In Islam, character is the sole criterion of greatness. "Surely, the most respectable of you, in the eyes of the Lord, is he who is the most virtuous of you," says the Qur-án. This equality of man with man, a Muslim finds most emphatically demonstrated in the mosque, because the mosque is the House of God. But is there a spot on earth where God is not? And does not Islam teach us that the earth's surface everywhere is a place for the worship of Allah? "Go wherever you may, there your God is," says the Qur-án. That being so, a Muslim cannot lose sight of that fundamental human equality in his daily life, which is permeated with the same idea. To the Muslim, he alone is worthy of respect who is virtuous. Hence, he cannot, for one instant, entertain the idea that the moment a particular individual wears the Caliphate cloak, that individual is metamorphosed into a being higher than he. As a man, he is still just what he

was; no sanctity attaches to his person for that incident.

The long and short of the matter is, that the temporal power of the Caliph is simply for the purpose of ensuring the safety of certain Islamic institutions. The preservation of peace in Arabia, and in Hedjaz, the land of pilgrimage, in particular; to see to the fulfilment of all the conditions necessary for the performance of "Haj" (pilgrimage); and to keep intact the sacred traditions of Islam in connection therewith—all such affairs are among the binding duties of the Caliph. In this, but in no other sense, is he the religious head of Islam; and his office does not imply any spiritual sanctity in his person.

Temporal power, therefore, is of the very essence of the Caliphate. If there be no temporal power, there can be no Caliphate. Attached to it, there must exist an Empire strong enough to enforce its will. Its resources must be adequate to meet the financial drain entailed by the discharge of its manifold religious functions. So far, all the heavy expenses involved have been met from the income derived from the more prosperous provinces of the Turkish Empire. The Treaty of Sèvres has left her only about one-fourth of her former territory, and if the financial provisions of the Treaty were, by any chance,

permitted to stand, the bankruptcy of Turkey would be a *fait accompli*—for that reason alone, irrespective of the Decree of Muharrem and the notorious Capitulations.

How is it possible for a place to be a worthy seat of the Caliphate if it affords protection to public-houses and houses of ill-fame, which are the corollaries of the capitulations? The importation of strong drink is necessarily covered in the provision of the capitulations dealing with trade, and if Europeans cannot be tried by Muslim law in the Turkish court, how could a non-Muslim law go against the undesirable houses in the Seat of Islam? Turkey, deprived of all its revenue-yielding provinces, cannot meet the demands of the Caliphate unless every economic pressure is removed. The capitulations have crippled Turkish trade. No local trade can flourish if any commodity can be had at a cheaper price from a European trader under the facilities of the capitulations. Turkey has been importing its foodstuffs from Russia and other European countries as she could not afford to cultivate her own land, because the imported stuff, under the facilities afforded by the capitulations, undersells the indigenous produce. The present Turkish agitation is really against the capitulations, as it undermines the sovereignty of Turkey. Other things

are of less consequence; but if the Mexican Government can exercise its judicial rights of sovereignty, why cannot the same rights be acceded to Turkey? The best thing would be for those who do not care to bring European subjects of Turkey under the Turkish law, to point out that such and such provisions of the said law go against civilization in the right sense of the word. If there is such a law, it should be repealed. It cannot be the Muslim law, as I do not see anything in it which cannot fulfil the requirements of civilization.

How is the Sultan to discharge the duties devolving upon him as Caliph? If the Muslims of India insist that he must be allowed to retain territories sufficient to maintain him in his position, is it an unreasonable requirement—the reckless demand of unscrupulous agitators? Or are they, as is insinuated by a writer in *Blackwood's*, simply playing into the hands of Mahatma Gandhi? To every Muslim Indian, the idea is grotesque in its falsity.

If the Indian Muslims did not shrink from standing by the British Empire in the hour of its dire need, rendering it ungrudging assistance both in men and money, it was because of their implicit trust in Britain's word of honour pledged to the integrity of

the Caliphate. Nevertheless, when the Treaty of Sèvres reduced the Caliphate to virtual impotence, how were the various aims and objects of its being to be fulfilled ? The glaring breach of faith—for it was nothing less, and many saw in it even more—came to them as a bolt from the blue. The fair name of Britain was thereby sullied, and what is worse, sophistical interpretations were put upon the plain words of the pledge, to obscure the plain issue.

There is no point at all in arguing that the Caliphate is a form of Papacy, and may exist without temporal power.

The recent speech of Rafat Pasha at Constantinople concerning the Caliphate, has given rise to a good deal of criticism and much speculation here in the English Press. The speech has appeared in full in the *Wakt*, a Constantinople paper, which I have had an opportunity of actually perusing. Its purport is very different from that of the brief report in the English papers. Rafat Pasha regards the establishment of the Caliphate as the grand achievement of Muhammad, the Conqueror, and of Salim. He is anxious to see Constantinople as the eternal seat of the Caliphate; and this he considers, for Turkish Muslims, an essential condition. Doubtless he would require—and rightly—that all powers of the Caliphate should ultimately devolve on

the Turkish people. He is opposed to despotism, whether centred in a king or president; and the latest decisions of the Angora National Assembly support his prediction as to the future government of Turkey.

This conception of government is almost identical with the definition of the Caliphate given by Umar the Great, the second Caliph; according to which there can be no Caliphate worthy of the name, which is not based on the people's will.

Complications would undoubtedly have arisen had the Muslim Caliphate been in any sense analogous to the Papacy; but the Caliphate in Islam, denotes simply and solely the power responsible for the maintenance of certain religious institutions. Whatever the form of government, the exercise of this power must, for all practical purposes, ultimately pass into the hands of a single individual—though constitutionally responsible to the people—who will not, however, go beyond the powers delegated to him. One so constituted head of a nation is more akin to the Muslim conception of a Caliph than any autocrat. Be he king, or president, or premier, the fact remains that the power of the government is, in fact, wielded by the individual.

In the heat of the moment, and the pressure of many other important matters which demand

immediate solution, the Angora National Pact represents a hasty, and possibly premature, pronouncement on a subject so peculiar in nature as that of the Caliphate; and therefore the Muslim world is not as yet seriously perturbed by the various proceedings reported from Angora. The question is not a difficult one. The Kemalists bear no grudge against the House of Othman, nor, on the other hand, does the love of the Muslims of the world for that house, amount to infatuation. To whatever extent the powers of the Sultan be limited, there is no infringement of the Caliphate institution involved, so long as the National Assembly, of which he is the figure-head, attends faithfully to the various demands of the Caliphate. Real effective power may rest with the National Assembly; but its exercise of power, if in accordance with the requirements of the Caliphate and carried out under the seal of the Caliph—be he Sultan or head of the Assembly—will not go against Muslim teaching.

The office of the Caliph is not hereditary; it may even go by election. The Caliph, moreover, can be deposed, if he does not adequately perform the duties of the Caliphate. Did not the great Caliph say, when assuming that office: "My brethren, I owe you several duties, and you have several

rights over me. One of them is that you should see that I do not misuse the revenue, another that I may not adopt wrong measures in the assessment of the revenue; that I should increase your salaries; protect the frontier; and that I should not involve you in unnecessary dangers. Wherever I err, you have a right to stop and take me to task." And again, "There is no Caliphate without the consultation of the general body of Mussulmans."

The first Caliph, Abu Bakr, said the same thing when he was elected to succeed the Prophet: "Correct me and put me right, if I am in error." After the decisive battle of Damascus, which occurred four years after the death of the Prophet, Maaz, when sent by the commander of the Muslim army to the Christian camp to discuss terms of peace, is reported to have replied when questioned concerning kingship in Islam, "You are proud that you have a king . . .; but our king does not assume any airs of superiority over others. If, God forbid, he were to commit wrong, we will inflict the same punishment on him as on another."

So long as the Turk accepts these golden words of Omar as his guiding precept, the whole Muslim world is with him. If the first builder of the Muslim Empire permitted his

subjects to take him to task for the reasons he gives, how can the dethronement of any of his successors, in a like contingency, affect the sacredness of the institution?

The Caliphate is, after all, a question for the Muslim world. Whatever may be his internal or foreign policy, of the wisdom of which he is surely the best judge, he cannot forget, and till now he has never forgotten, that the Caliphate is the common interest of every Muslim wherever he may be, and he cannot act in any way counter to Muslim opinion.

It is surely unnecessary to point out that it is in the best interests of Britain itself to see that the Muslim Caliphate remains intact. In so doing she will promote her own welfare —more especially if the question be kept scrupulously clear from false issues. Friendly relations with the Caliph will, in the long run, prove beneficial to her own security and stability. For, in this respect, the question of the Caliphate is not a local one, nor appertaining to one country to the exclusion of others. It is not true to say that Indian Muslims alone, of all the Muslim world, evince interest in its cause. The telegrams shown to Lord Curzon by the French President tell a different story. They show that the French possessions are no less keen about it; and it

is the same with Afghanistan. The jubilations which took place all over the world of Islam, including Syria and Palestine, at the fall of Smyrna, ought to serve as an object lesson to those journals and publicists who doubt the universality of the Caliphate cause. In corroboration of which I quote from the *Khilafat Bulletin*, an account of what took place in Afghanistan on that occasion:

A message from Kabul, dated 11th September states that the fall of Smyrna to the Turks caused great emotion among the inhabitants there and that a large congregation gathered in the Mosque for a thanksgiving service. The Emir of Afghanistan declared the day an official holiday, and addressed a long telegram to Mustapha Kemal, calling him the "Standard of Islam."

CHAPTER VIII

RECONCILIATION OF ISLAM

RECONCILIATION with Islam is now admitted on all sides to be a desirable thing; but that admission carries with it a tacit acknowledgment, that the Government which claimed to be the greatest Muslim Power in the world, has, in its conception and discharge of its own duties, been found wanting.

A kingdom, so runs the teaching of the Qur-án,[1] exists only for the benefit of its subjects, and all its laws and ordinances, its policy, both at home and abroad, should be framed to that end; yet it has lately been the lot of Muslims to see a very different conception of duty in active operation. The military demonstration at Chanak on the part of the Muslim Power in question—the Government of Great Britain—was intended, it has been said, to cow the spirit of Muslims throughout the world. Mr. Bonar Law, who, in his recent utterances, has adopted a somewhat modified tone towards Muslim suscepti-

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. lxvii.

bilities, feeling that he had, nevertheless, to say to the world something that would justify the action of the Government at Chanak, admits that the military display was, in part at least, intended to exercise a deterrent influence upon Muslim India.

England may be proud of her diplomacy, but in this case it compared poorly with that of France. Mr. Bonar Law's latest reference to our susceptibilities, seems but a faint—rather half-hearted—echo of the sentiments of the French Premier. "Though France will not depart," so says M. Poincaré, "from her traditional policy of protecting the Christian minorities, yet she must not forget that she is a great Muslim Power." M. Poincaré is said to have shown Lord Curzon—on the occasion of that statesman's first emergency visit to Paris during the recent crisis—a sheaf of telegrams, received from the Muslim dependencies of France, all expressive of the very real and deep interest taken in the Turkish situation by Muslims all over the world. It is possible that Lord Curzon, who, it is reported, was greatly impressed by what he saw and heard, was not above deducing what is after all the fairly obvious moral—to wit, that England, being a greater Muslim Power than France, should pay at least as much regard to the feelings of her Muslim subjects as to the so-called

Christian minorities, who are, in fact, the subjects of other Powers.

French policy has clearly been moulded with due regard to the rights and susceptibilities of Islam, which England has admittedly neglected. On the other hand, every effort was made to induce France to alter her course. The daily Press gave her to understand that in not uniting with Great Britain, she was bringing Western civilization to chaos before the advancing hordes of Islam; and again and again, to various tunes and assorted measures, the chorus was taken up, of which the burden was that England, and incidentally Europe, could only be rendered stable and strong, in so far as Islam was made weak. A like suggestion came also, in comparatively veiled language, from an American writer—one, Stoddard—who appears to have hit upon an admirable method of popularizing his literary activities, which would seem to have been widely appreciated in the English Press, by entering on a sort of campaign of terrorism—combining ingeniously the terror to be apprehended from Islam, and the terror germinating in the African coloured races, which of course are to a great extent Muslim, in one comprehensive impending Terror—which has been, on the whole, gratefully received. There is, he thinks, a rising wave of Islam; the

coloured peoples are outnumbering the white races, and the menace to the West is great and growing. Books such as this—piquantly sensational—and the favourable reviews that fall to their lot, are responsible in a greater degree for stirring up racial prejudices against the Englishman in India, than any maladroitness of the Administration.

If a diplomatic conscience leads you to discountenance Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's work on the Congo—out of consideration for Belgian feelings, and leads Germany to threaten dire things against a periodical (in Persian) published in Berlin and called *A'zad-i-Sharq*—out of respect for your feelings, can it not influence you to take some step towards stemming the rising flood of misleading, anti-Islamic literature, disguising a not too scrupulous propaganda—out of sympathy for our feelings? Misinterpretation we can understand, misunderstanding we can make allowance for, but for misrepresentation there is seldom, if ever, justification or excuse.

There is little edification for a nation or individual in reading fictitious accounts of the shortcomings of another. For the last ten years I have read of the manifold evils of Islam in current English literature; evils of which I had never heard, whose existence I had never so much as suspected before coming

to this country; and in the Faith of Islam I find no trace of them at all. I am constantly receiving inquiries about them, and I can only reply that they do not exist—and, so far as I am aware, never have existed. Muslim readers of such productions become irritated, and sometimes annoyed—and, on occasions, angrily indignant. Neither the English stage nor the English cinema is free from this unfortunate tendency. "The Auction of Souls"—that exotic blend, nicely adjusted to the popular taste, of mendacity, ribaldry and blasphemy—is running a prosperous course in the provinces, until and unless perhaps the authorities see fit to intervene—a step which, from motives of diplomacy, and apart altogether from the outraged feelings of Muslim British subjects, may yet suggest itself on the analogies I have quoted.

I confess, I hold a diametrically opposite view from that which commends itself to Mr. Stoddard. To make friends with Muslims, to help them in their aspirations, will be a great asset in the stabilization of British rule. Every well-wisher of the Government in India would hail with joy any such indication of the dawning existence of a new psychology in the British nation—of the desire to reconcile Islam. It would not have been so difficult a year ago as it will be to-day. The problem

has undergone considerable complication during the last twelve months, and Muslims in India and Hindus have joined hands, and are pledged to mutual support; and no lover of India could wish it otherwise.

The worst feature of the present situation is, that any and every movement—no matter whether it be right or wrong, and however insignificant its origin—if it happens to invite Government opposition, receives cordial support everywhere. The Government cannot hope to justify even its best measure, in the eyes of a hostile community. It would be the biggest blunder imaginable to contemplate a rule of machine-guns and martial law. British prestige has already sunk lamentably, as a result of Sir Michael O'Dwyer's experiment in 1919. On the other hand, Mr. Gandhi is sweeping all before him with his scheme of non-violence; and when once that scheme is established, there will remain no possible pretext, justifiable in the eyes of the civilized world, for the exercise of force. Redress of grievances is the only course; but Indian problems are many and varied, and their solution demands that you take stock of, and generally overhaul the whole situation, so that a new policy may be devised, suitable to the conditions that will then be disclosed.

Muslim India presents yet another diffi-

culty; which is, however, I fancy, somewhat easier of solution. The interest of the Muslim Indian is not bounded by the shores of India; and in my opinion his feelings for Arabia and Turkey over the matter of the Caliphate, is far more real, far stronger, than his desire for Indian Home Rule. It may not always be so —but that is Muslim psychology at present. He is a zealot and will go to any extremes of suffering to secure the full freedom of Turkey. More than two-thirds of the Muslim population of India—and two years ago I should have said nine-tenths of it—is even now lukewarm as regards Indian politics. They do not bother themselves about such things, but they are all alert in the cause of Turkey; though a marvellous change has occurred in their attitude, since the victories of the Angora troops. Muslims were urging the Viceroy to wire the Home Government not to use Indian troops against the Turk, when the ultimatum was given, and a critical situation arose which was only allayed by the patience and tact of the Viceroy; but now they have come to realize that their interests abroad can best be served by looking after their interests at home—and those who deplore this new development have only the Coalition Ministry to thank for it. In spite of all the efforts to lower the prestige of the Turk, he has come

closer to Muslim hearts everywhere; so much so indeed that the Indian Muslims will lend willing support, at once, to any good measure, if it comes to them through Turkey.

Lord Beaconsfield had insight enough to perceive this trait of the Indian; he made of Turkey a friend, and an instrument to win Muslim support, in the days of the Mutiny; and to-day Lord Islington is only doing what is essentially right and wise, when he urges the nation to make a friend of Turkey.[1]

[1] An Englishman writes the following in the *Muslim Standard*, October 19, 1922:—

"WE HAVE NO CAUSE FOR WAR WITH TURKEY.

"It is high time that claptrap about the Turks should cease and that sense rather than sentiment should direct our relations with the Turkish Empire. Sentiment does not save the foreign markets for British merchants—nor provide employment for the ex-Service men.

"Unfortunately the House of Commons is ignorant and prejudiced with regard to Turkey—not only is it contrary to the traditions of this country to destroy Turkey, it is moreover against her best interests to *even weaken Turkey*. The strengthening of Turkey is one of the surest bases of European peace; further, it is the only way to restore Britain's lost prestige and position in the East, and to strengthen her position in the Mediterranean, which is becoming more and more precarious every day. With a strong Turkey, Russia cannot think of the Straits and Constantinople, Germany finds no interests in Anatolia, and France, having concluded an *entente* with Turkey, can settle her own difficulties in Syria. And England may remain in India to continue

Dr. John Pollen writes in the current number of the *Asiatic Review* :—

About the Caliphate—the matter is one altogether for Muslims themselves, and there should be no Christian interference of any kind whatever. The Caliphate should be immune. A word from the Muslim Caliph to his Indian co-religionists would produce a wonderful result, and this result the British Government should lay itself out to obtain."

The Caliphate, and the Caliph, are the first considerations of the Muslim. The rest of India, at the present time, holds the British Raj as synonymous with tyranny and oppression; and now even the Muslims, I am afraid, are not far off the point of regarding England as an enemy, and that on account of Turkey.

The whole of Muslim India has been *en fête*, beflagged and rejoicing, over the victories of Mustapha Kemal; and the Hindus have

her beneficent work there, and until India as an Empire has that cohesion, that will enable her to resist aggression from outside, and defend herself—then the British ægis will be withdrawn, but not at the dictation of foreigners, however Muscovite.

"On the other hand, with the Muslim world against her 'Of which Turkey is the centre,' England may as well write 'Finis' to Empire. As matters are at this moment, 'in Ireland' and in the East, I doubt whether much longer under the present Parliament led by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill we shall ever possess a 'British Emporium.'"

been no whit behind the rest in enthusiasm, just to show that, in weal or woe their sympathies are with their fellow-countrymen, their brethren.

But, unfortunately, those victories have been regarded as victories over England. I should be untrue to my own sense of loyalty to the Government, as well as to my own brethren in Faith, if I attempted to conceal this, or any other unpalatable fact. It is not yet too late. There is still time for a broader, saner policy, a wiser, more sympathetic attitude of mind—if displayed in the forthcoming peace proposals—to work wonders. But there is no time to be lost in this matter. Muslim hatred of British rule—alas that I should have to use the words!—may become, ere all is done, stronger than that of other Indians; and all because of ill-advised statements of ill-advised British statesmen over the ill-advised incident of Chanak.

The Muslims accept the identity of Turkey with Islam. Are they then wrong if they believe that the hostile attitude of the Government towards Turkey is hostility towards Islam? The logic seems simple enough. The whole Muslim world entertains the same view. I have referred to Afghanistan elsewhere in this connection. The telegrams shown by M. Poincaré to Lord Curzon, disclosed the same

state of mind in Tunis and Algeria, on hearing of the Greek defeat. Islam and Turkey have, in this respect, become synonymous, a fact which should not be forgotten by England—as a Muhammadan Government.

Apart from this, however, the case of the Indian Muslims is a starting-point for the work of British statesmanship, in the matter of its various Indian problems. I do not commend the policy of *Divide et impera*. In fact, like others of my countrymen, I detest it.

The Indian mentality is at the moment excited over the subject of Turkey and not in a condition to appreciate good intentions. When, however, that excitement subsides a little, a portion of India will be in a better mood to judge of your actions, and will co-operate with you heartily for the furtherance of any good scheme which you may have in mind. Reforms are, without doubt, needed; and I cannot find that opinion in England is in any way averse to them; but the best of schemes will come to nothing if the people are suspicious, and decline to co-operate.

Muslims are grateful. He who is not grateful to his fellow-being—so says the noble Prophet—is not grateful to his Creator; and the return of good is nothing but good, according to the teaching of the Qur-án.[1] What have

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. lv, vc. 60.

you gained by siding with the Greek? And what will you not gain by making a friend of Turkey? If you act generously towards Turkey (which at the present juncture is to do good to Islam), Muslims will be acting in defiance of the Qur-án if they do not, in their turn, do good to you. The war has left the Caliphate—the most sacred and dearest institution in Islam—shattered, its prestige lowered, its vitality weakened; and if it be your wish that Muslims should forget the past—and the Muslim is a loveable soul in this respect—do not grudge any consideration that may help to make Constantinople a proper seat for the Caliphate.

Great Britain has not realized her opportunities as a Muslim ruler. France, on the other hand, has achieved a masterpiece of statecraft; and shown herself more entitled to be called a Muslim Government than England. The first stone of a mosque to be erected in the French capital, was laid recently, on ground given for the purpose by the City of Paris; and soon from the Place de l'Ermite, will rise a minaret of which M. Colrat, Minister of Justice, said recently: "It will be as one more prayer mounting to the skies of France, but Notre Dame will not be jealous." And speaking of the sympathy of France for Islam, Marshal Lyautey, who presided at the

ceremony, which was attended by distinguished representatives of all the Mussulman subjects of France, and included also the delegates of Angora and Constantinople, said that

those who wished to serve France in Mussulman countries must learn to respect not only their own religion but others, though they should begin with that in which their nation was born and had grown. They would thus be able to appreciate the depth and power of the religious spirit wherever they encountered it, just as visitors from Muslim countries to France had been surprised by the strength of religious feeling here and had found their confidence and sympathy increased thereby.

In the course of his speech, Marshal Lyautey paid a high tribute to the quality of Mustapha Kemal. He said:

"We have seen in the Orient, arising under the influence of that true statesman, Mustapha Kemal, an effort of national restoration, construction, and organization which has our hearty sympathy. It is well that the echo of this sympathy should be heard there, where other echoes have recently sounded. It should be known there that we are not accepting historical errors as ultimate truth, and that we are honourably concentrating all our efforts towards the conclusion of the peace which the world desires." (*Daily Telegraph.*)

If, in the light of these occurrences, Muslims should have to choose between England and France, it is not difficult to guess the side on which the choice would fall. Contrast the two countries—the one proud to call herself Muhammadan, the other clamorous against the re-entry of the Turk into Europe. In

the coming Peace Conference lies the opportunity of atoning for what is past.

London is the capital of the greatest Muhammadan Government, yet without any monument to show that it is so. If Notre Dame will not be jealous of the minaret of the Paris mosque, why should the towers of Canterbury begrudge the prayer floating heavenward from the London minaret?

Muslim subjects of France have contributed to the cost of the Paris mosque, and the Muslim States in India would deem it a most sacred duty to find any sum required to erect a mosque in London, should such a scheme be launched. In the beginning of 1919, my advice was sought by Colonel Wilcock, at the India Office, as to the removal of the remains of those who gave their lives for England on the battlefield, to a place where a monument was to be raised in memory of the departed. I do not know whether the scheme came to anything, or whether it is still in the air; but I pointed out that if something was done in England, it would be sufficient, and, indeed, all things considered, preferable.

A mosque in London, would be a potent antidote against the most glaring blunders of Downing Street; which, like the rest of history, must, I suppose, be expected to repeat themselves; and not only that, but it will add

a lodestone of extraordinary power to the world's Metropolis, a source of world-compelling attraction.

Woking, a quiet little English country town, has become dear to Muslims the world over, on account of its mosque—showing, on a humble scale it is true, how it might also be with London.

It may be objected that a mosque in London might develop into a centre of Islamic culture and of controversy—of conflict with Christianity and the ideals of the West. In the following chapter I shall endeavour to show that such a fear is groundless.

CHAPTER IX

THE IDEAL OF RELIGIONS

A RELIGION which does not number among its ideals—those ideals attainable in a greater or less degree on earth, that is—peace and the progress of mankind towards the Light, has no claim to call itself a religion from God. Man, Nature's best product and God's best handiwork [1]—Man, the seat of illimitable potentialities,[2] cannot avail himself of these his privileges unless there be a Light to guide him. Passions, purified, become changed in him to what is noble and good; unchecked, unbridled, they turn to a perennial spring of misery and evil. In order to achieve the former, which is progress, and eschew the latter, which is the very negation of all peace, there came from the Creator of All a message to His created, and to that message mankind has given a name—which is Religion.

Could such a Divine Message remain confined, limited in its application to any one

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xvii, ver. 70.
[2] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xcv, ver. 6.

class, or to any particular country or race of men, or to any one definite and particular period in the history of mankind? Would not such limitation and particularization constitute a slur on the universal Fatherhood of God, savouring of partiality or caprice, the weaknesses of an earthly father that man dare not, overtly at least, associate with the Eternal? God's message, then, to His creation, if given to different nations at different times will, accordingly, show differences in its tenor from time to time; yet its essentials must remain the same, seeing that those faculties for good, for the ripening of which the message was sent, are, and have been, the same throughout all mankind. Religion is for the uplifting of humanity, and the surest road to human edification is, from the Muslim's point of view, to seek the glory of God. But we Muslims hold that this truth—simple and in all respects conclusive as it seems to us to-day—did not actually manifest itself to mankind before the revelation of the Qur-án, which proclaimed the Gospel in the words: "Every nation was given a Messenger," "Every race had its guide from God," [1] "And there has been no community which has not had its Warner." [2]

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xiii, ver. 7.
[2] Ibid., chap. xxxv, ver. 24.

Islam, which means first, peace; secondly, the way to achieve peace; and thirdly, submission, that is to say, submission to another's will, is, we say, the surest road to peace—Muslim eyes can see no surer road to "Peace on earth" and the perpetual end of the orgy of strife and bloodshed which has since the birth of time, almost, been carried on, alas, in the name of Religion; and no more complete marching orders than those set out in the words:—

> Say: We believe in Allah and (in) that which has been revealed to us, and (in) that which was revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and (in) that which was given to Moses and Jesus and (in) that which was given to the Prophets from their Lord; we do not make any distinction between any of them, and to Him do we submit (The Holy Qur-án, chap. ii, ver. 136).

No man can remain a Muslim if he makes any distinction at all in his reverence for and allegiance to the Messengers of the Most High, Muhammad, Jesus, Moses and the other great prophets of the world. It stands to reason that if you pin your faith to one Personality—to the utter exclusion of any others—and your faith is to you a real thing, you will find yourself at variance with other men, such variance as may well, in the cunning hands of Time and Circumstance,

militate strongly against harmonious relations with your fellows—that is, against Peace. If, on the other hand, we all acknowledge our submission to Almighty God—which submission is, I repeat, the religious significance of the word "Islam"—and in that common allegiance accept all the prophets of the world as God's messengers, teachers of one and the same religion; disregarding the religious differences, additions here, subtractions there, made from time to time by the priestly class of this Faith or that—innovations from which the message preached by Muhammad has alone remained free—and uniting on the bed-rock of Faith, which is common to all, should we be not putting away from us for ever the greatest enemy to Peace that exists in the world to-day?

If a Muslim accepts Jesus of Nazareth as his own Master and Teacher—which is his bounden duty in accordance with the Qur-án—and if, like millions of Christians, he looks on the Church's dogmas as innovations, how should trouble arise between the Muslim and the Christian of to-day? I shall be told perhaps that inasmuch as Christians are not agreed among themselves on this question of dogmas—some accepting as integral what others reject as accessory, and vice versa; and very few, possibly, being prepared to

reject them all—my hypothesis is illusory; and such may be the case; yet "he that is not against us is on our part," and the suggestion on which my hypothesis is based, a wide, sane and reasoned, not tolerance merely, but generous appreciation of that aspect of our brother's belief which "is on our part," is surely an ideal within the reach of all. On the other hand, if the Church of Christ, which bases its faith on Christ's Divinity, cherishes no animosity towards Unitarians, Liberal Christians, Spiritualists and other newly sprung religious growths which deny that Divinity, but consorts with them on terms of amity, regarding them as of the fold if not in it, why should it make it a point of honour, as it were, to be at variance with the Muslim?

The theory of modern Churchmen—as voiced by Dr. Rashdall and others—touching the nature of the Divinity of Jesus, the incarnation of the Divine Character, is in no respect incompatible with Islam. "Imbue yourself with Divine Attributes," which means reproduce, illustrate in your own life to the utmost of your capacity, the Divine Character, is the watchword of Islam, given to his followers by Muhammad. We accept Jesus as a sinless personality, a reproduction of the Divine Character; but we believe the

same of every other of the prophets that God has sent into the world. And we go further even than that. We believe in the inherent sinlessness of man's nature[1]—a nature which, made "of the goodliest fibre," is capable of limitless progress, setting him above the angels and leading him to the border of Divinity. God—in Islam—is the prototype of man,[2] and His Attributes form the basis of the Muslim rule of life.[3] Righteousness, in Islam, consists in leading a life in harmony as complete as possible with the Divine attributes.[3] To act otherwise is sin,[3] which is a thing acquired and not a heritage. Men and women, alike in essence, alike in soul,[4] have been equipped with equal capacity for intellectual, spiritual and moral attainments.[5] Islam places man and woman under like obligations, the one to the other,[6] and has given to women rights denied by other civilizations.[7]

These are the Muslim truths, and if they are in any degree accepted to-day as Christian verities too—irrespective of whether or not

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xxx, ver. 30.
[2] Ibid., chap. iii, ver. 78.
[3] Ibid., chap. vii, ver. 180.
[4] Ibid., chap. iv, ver. 1.
[5] Ibid., chap. xxxiii, ver. 35.
[6] Ibid., chap. ii, ver. 208
[7] Ibid., chap. iv, ver. 11.

they have any direct bearing on the Biblical record—is it not possible at least to regard Islam and Christianity as taught by Jesus as branches of the same tree?

There is more wrangling among Christians than between Muslims and millions of them who call themselves Christians, and are accepted as Christians.

Religion, in war and diplomacy, is constantly used to mask political objectives—as witness the modern instance of the "Christian minorities"—but Christianity and Islam, with all their divergencies, are sister religions, and I see no reason why they must be for ever, or at all, at daggers drawn. The Crusades of the past represented an artificial hostility—and it is, to say the least, unfortunate that one, if not two, of your late Premiers have thought fit to put the recent war—in so far as it concerned the Near East—in the same category as the Crusades.

In the light of the passages which I am about to quote, is it possible for a Muslim to cherish any hostile feeling at all towards Jesus or the followers of Jesus?—

And when the angels said: O Mary! surely Allah has chosen *you* and purified *you* and chosen *you* above the women of the world (chap. iii, ver. 41).

When the angels said: O Mary! surely Allah gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose

name is the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, worthy of regard in this world and the hereafter, and of those who are made near (to Allah) (chap. iii, ver. 44).

When Allah said: O Jesus, I will cause *you* to die and exalt *you* in My presence and clear *you* of those who disbelieve and make those who follow *you* above those who disbelieve to the day of resurrection, then to Me shall be your return, so I will decide between you concerning that in which you differed (chap. iii, ver. 54).

This day (all) the good things are allowed to you, and the food of those who have been given the Book [Christians and others] is lawful for you and your food lawful for them (chap. v, ver. 5).

Certainly *you will* find the most violent of people in enmity for those who believe (to be) the Jews and those who are polytheists, and *you will* certainly find the nearest in friendship, to those who believe (to be) those who say: We are Christians; this is because there are priests and monks among them and because they do not behave proudly (chap. v, ver. 82).

He said: Surely I am a servant of Allah; He has given me the Book and made me a prophet:

And He has made me blessed wherever I may be, and He has enjoined on me prayer and poor-rate as long as I live:

And dutiful to my mother, and He has not made me insolent, unblessed:

And peace on me the day I was born, and on the day I die, and on the day I am raised to life.

Such is Jesus son of Mary; (this is) the saying of truth about which they dispute (chap. xix, ver. 30–34).[1]

Can a Muslim speak or write or think or teach evil of the teachers of other religions if

[1] English translation of the Qur-án, by M. Muhammad Ali, *Islamic Review* Office, Woking.

they are his own prophets, as the Qur-án says, and brought the one message from the Lord? Religion, in its purity, is the same in every country; but the Sacred Scriptures, the Divine Revelation of nearly every Faith, has suffered much at the hands of man, from the ravages of time and commentary. The revelation of the Qur-án claims, as is stated in the Qur-án itself, only to restore truth[1] previously revealed to its original purity and to give again that which has been lost.

Certain writers in the daily Press have, largely for political ends, I fear, written contemptuously of Muslim culture; asserting that Islam, if allowed to spread unchecked, will reduce Western civilization, its standards and ideals, to a condition of chaos—a line of argument which is an insult to Muslims and a libel on Islam.

Backwardness in education and the various aspects of that which is called culture is due, where indeed it exists, rather to the economic pressure exercised on us by our Western neighbours than to a faulty educational system or unenlightened doctrine. Muslims of to-day, conscious of that pressure, and dazzled by the unfamiliar glare of that material civilization which is peculiarly the

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xcviii, ver. 3.

product of the West—from which, however, they are, be it noted, rapidly recovering—may, in a measure, have forgotten their own ways; and here I am tempted to make a brief digression which is, perhaps, not entirely beside the point. If you of the West boast of Democracy as a thing desirable and to be envied, do not forget that it is Islam that has given birth to Democracy in its highest, and at the same time most practicable, form.[1] Our faith in the Unity of God means the equality of mankind.[2]

Lineage, riches and family honours are accidental things; virtue and the service of humanity are the matters of real merit.[3] Distinctions of colour, race and creed are unknown in the ranks of Islam. All mankind is of one family,[4] and Islam has succeeded in welding the black and the white into one fraternal whole.

Islam encourages the exercise of personal judgment and respects difference of opinion, which, according to the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad, is a blessing of God.

Every labour which enables man to live honestly is respected. Idleness is deemed a sin.[5]

[1] See page 110.
[2] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xviii, ver. 110.
[3] Ibid., chap. xlix, ver. 13.
[4] Ibid., chap. ii, ver. 213.
[5] Sayings of Muhammad.

All the faculties of man have been given to him as a trust from God,[1] for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. It is man's duty to live for others, and his charities must be applied without any distinction of persons. Charity in Islam brings man nearer to God.[2] Charity and the giving of alms have been made obligatory, and every person who possesses property above a certain limit has to pay a tax, levied on the rich for the benefit of the poor.

We do not find in Islam, side by side, sons in affluence and parents in poverty. To honour his parents is man's next duty, after that of honouring his God.[3] There are no neglected wives and children with us—neither is marriage the lottery which the cynical proverb of the West would have it. Unemployment is unknown to us—and our lands are free from gambling, drink and prostitution—the curses peculiar to Western civilization, which follow it whithersoever it penetrates or attempts to gain a footing—even to Baghdad and Damascus.

The civilization of the West boasts itself of its achievements in material science rather than of its progress in the things of the soul; yet the world witnessed its most

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xxxiii, ver. 72.
[2] Sayings of Muhammad.
[3] The Holy Qur-án, chap. xvii, ver. 23.

remarkable renaissance of scientific activity immediately after the coming of Islam and in those countries which had adopted the Muslim faith.

The world worshipped Nature and its elements as deities; and though the thinking portion of mankind early dissociated itself from the vulgar in this respect, it was left for Islam to stabilize on a scientific and rational basis the relationship of man with man—and of man with Nature, teaching in the one respect his equality, in the other his dominance. In the clearest possible terms it gave the following gospel to humanity.

Do you not see that Allah has made what is in the heavens and what is in the earth subservient to you, and made complete to you His favours outwardly and inwardly? And among men is he who disputes in respect of Allah though having no knowledge, nor guidance, nor a book giving light (The Holy Qur-án, chap. xxxi, ver. 20).

Allah is He who created the heavens and the earth and sent down water from the clouds, then brought forth with it fruits as a sustenance for you, and He has made the ships subservient to you, that they might run their course in the sea by His command, and He has made the rivers subservient to you.

And He has made subservient to you the sun and the moon pursuing their courses, and He has made subservient to you the night and the day (The Holy Qur-án, chap. xiv, ver. 32–33).

Such teaching could not fail to give the strongest possible impetus to practical

scientific research—having for its object the improvement of man's material condition. But we have still to reach that pinnacle of scientific attainment foretold in the Qur-án—when the sun, the moon and the planets shall be made subservient to our will. Acquisition of knowledge was made an obligation laid equally upon men and women by the Holy Prophet; and the investigation of the various manifestations of Nature with a view to their ultimate service to humanity was disclosed to be a laudable object of knowledge, by the Qur-án.[1] Islam is not a creed of formalism, but it lays down certain broad unchangeable principles of the law[2] applicable to each plane of human activity, and allowing ample scope for research and investigation to meet the needs of the time.

A new era is dawning on the world, and we are assured that the new Government of this country is pledged to Peace or Tranquillity, or at least to that quality which is implied in both; but there can be no world-peace if an essentially narrow-minded patriotism is to be the guiding principle of your policy.

The British Empire is in itself a little world comprising many nations—yet with a pre-

[1] The Holy Qur-án, chap. iii, ver. 119.
[2] Ibid., chap. xiv, ver. 24.

ponderance of Muslims; from which circumstance the British Government is sometimes styled a Muhammadan Government. It is, at the same time, a Christian Government. Both religions have the same belief in God—both agree in that the whole duty of man in each is to walk humbly with the Lord, and if the desire so to do, find a place in the hearts and minds of those who are called upon to fill the responsible positions of the Government, peace may yet be assured.

Printed in Great Britain by

UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED

LONDON AND WOKING

INDIA IN THE BALANCE

By KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

Some Press Opinions

". . . noteworthy as the first detailed study published in this country from the pen of an Islamic divine, on the vexed problem of a settlement with Turkey."—*The Times.*

"It sets forth in the clearest manner, without rancour or extravagance, the claims of the Muslims in India and Palestine and it shows how little remains among Muslims of faith in Britain's word."—*Daily News.*

"We hope a great many people will read *India in the Balance* . . . and we can promise them that if they do, they will find a great deal of interest in it."—*Daily Mail.*

"All who care to understand the causes of the unrest in India, evidenced by the Gandhi movement and other startling symptoms, will obtain here considerable enlightenment."—*Star.*

"It is well that we should read this book and ponder over its message."—Lord Meston, in *Sunday Times.*

". . . will certainly interest those who read."—*People.*

"The Muslim side of the great problem of Indian discontent is presented on the whole with studied moderation."—*Yorkshire Post.*

"He places the fact before the reader in a most lucid manner, which cannot be misapprehended by even the densest Briton whose knowledge of Eastern affairs is of the flimsiest order."—*Nottingham Guardian.*

"Views are put forward in a reasoned and reasonable way, and . . . every word he writes should be carefully weighed by all students of affairs in India."—*Sheffield Independent.*

". . . a valuable explanation of the Moslem standpoint."—*Sheffield Daily Telegraph.*

". . . deserves to be read as one side of a very serious problem." —*Glasgow Herald.*

"It is important that the Muslim view should be understood. The author of *India in the Balance* states it clearly and moderately —more clearly than it has hitherto been set forth for English readers. The book should be read by everybody who cares about peace in the East, and certainly no Member of Parliament who would claim to be fully instructed on Near and Middle Eastern problems can afford to ignore this statement of the Muslim case . . . half the interest in Kwaja Kamal-ud-Din's book is in the number of shocks it gives to Western complacency."—*Birmingham Post.*

". . . peculiarly welcome just now."—*South Wales News.*

". . . approaches the subject from a strictly impartial point of view."—*Dublin Herald.*

". . . a useful and timely contribution to the controversy aroused in Muslim India, by the treatment of Turkey under the Treaty of Sèvres."—*Edinburgh Evening News.*

"He has stated the plain truth."—*Irish Times.*

"The Indian Muslim case . . . is authoritatively stated."— *Birmingham Gazette.*

"There is much in the volume that will not commend itself to all readers, but on the principle of 'hearing both sides,' *India in the Balance* will repay perusal."—*Bristol Evening News.*

"The book will be found indispensable by all who are interested in the present position of the Eastern question."—*Cambridge Review.*

". . . gives a very clear impression of conditions in India at the present time . . . we recommend the book to all Liberals who are interested in the subject, as all should be."—*Liberal Magazine.*

"A very excellent little book. . . . The author . . . presents the Muslim case with a dignity of argument which is characteristic of the best of his community, and if an Englishman is ever able to put himself in another man's shoes, the book ought to have a salutary effect."—*Socialist Review.*

". . . throws light upon the causes of Moslem unrest in India, and bewails the ignorance of the British Government and people, but especially of Anglo-Indians regarding the fundamentals of the Faith of Islam."—W. CYPRIAN BRIDGE, in *Foreign Affairs.*

"The quiet, controlled and fair way in which the author expounds his arguments lends them considerable force and authority."— *Lloyd George Liberal Magazine.*

"The book is most opportune."—*Asiatic Review.*

"We heartily commend this informing work to our readers"—*Liberal Christian.*

"Those who wish to see the case for Indian self-government, and a restrained indictment of much of what has been going on in India . . . would do well to get *India in the Balance.*"—*Freethinker.*

"One of the most arresting books on the subject that has come the way of this reviewer. . . . It is a book that by some means ought to be put into the hands of every member of the House of Commons."—*Book Post.*

"The author is well qualified to speak on the subject."—*Egyptian Gazette* (Alexandria).

"It is . . . of more than ordinary interest to meet with an expression of Islam's opinion regarding British Rule in India and the Caliphate delivered with a moderation often too lacking in the vernacular when Indian political affairs are discussed."—*Natal Advertiser.*

"Moslem India has a case, and the Imam puts that case at its best. He writes with moderation and sincerity, and with indignation tempered by regret."—*Cape Times.*

"No more lucid and convincing exposition of the whole Khilafat question has been given than that contained in this book."—*Bombay Chronicle.*

"A very interesting and informing book."—*New India.*

"The volume is an admirable summing up of the rationale, political as well as religious, of the whole Khilafat question."—*Muhammedan.*

"The book is a very timely publication, and we would advise everyone interested in Indian politics to get a copy and read it."—*Rangoon Mail.*

. . . will serve as a general warning to such Englishmen as are open to consider the pros and cons of the question."—*Rangoon Daily News.*

"A smart earnestly written book."—*Daily Telegraph and Deccan Herald.*

"It gives serious food for thought."—*Amrita Bazaar.*

". . . an authentic and valuable contribution to the subject. . . . The book is very well written and full of fresh facts . . . will be really useful to those who desire to understand the Caliphate question." -*Hindustan and Akbar Sondagar.*

THE

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING

Edited by

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

The only Torchbearer of Islam in the West.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the interest of Islam and Muslims.

Articles on Religious, Ethical and Social Questions and Developments, Mysticism in Islam, Current Topics, Correspondence, Reviews, etc.

It is the aim of this Journal to act as a bond between Muslims of all nations, and especially the English-speaking Muslims of the West.

Circulated throughout the World

Annual Subscription 10/- post free

THE HOLY QUR-ÁN

WITH

Complete Arabic Text, Introduction, Translation and Commentary (1,400 pages)

BY

HIS HOLINESS MAULVI MUHAMMAD ALI

OPINIONS:

"It is certainly a work of which any scholar might legitimately be proud. The skilful presentation of the results of his researches shows that he has been an apt scholar in the school of Western Methodology."—*The Quest.*

"We have here in an attractive form, and bound in flexible leather cover, the first English translation and commentary of the Qur-án by a Moslem theologian. The Arabic text, written by expert caligraphists in India, accompanies each verse."—*The Times.*

"The Commentary is remarkably full and interesting."—*Westminster Gazette* (London).

"The arrangement of the book is highly praiseworthy and the method adopted scholarly. The book is a valuable addition to the religious literature of Islam."—*The East and West.*

"We have seen the translation critically, and have no hesitation in remarking that the simplicity of its language and the correctness of the version are all enviable."—*The Wakeel.*

PRICES: Morocco, **50/-**; Pluvinsin, **40/-**; Cloth, **30/-**

Packing and Postage: Inland, 2/-; Foreign, 4/-

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE MOSQUE - - - - - WOKING

THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM

BY

THE RT. HON. SYED AMEER ALI

P.C., LL.D., D.L., C.I.E., ETC.

New and Revised Edition, with two additional chapters

An account of the life and ministry of the Prophet and of the Evolution of Islam ; a comprehensive survey of its aspirations and ideals.

A Rational and Philosophical Exposition of Islam.

PRICE 30/- NET

THE TEACHING OF ISLAM

A solution of five fundamental religious problems from the Muslim point of view.

PRICE 3/- NET

A WESTERN AWAKENING TO ISLAM

BY

THE RT. HON. LORD HEADLEY

An arresting presentation of modern Christianity in the light of Islam.

PRICE 2/- NET

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

THE MOSQUE - - - - - WOKING